

Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, urging the passage of House bill 15369, for the creation of a bureau of public roads to provide a system for the permanent improvement of the public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Long Island Lodge, No. 13, Sons of Benjamin, Brooklyn, N. Y., condemning the methods in vogue at the immigration bureau at the port of New York regarding the deportation of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Protests against the passage of House bill 16457, to amend section 3394 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to tobacco, from the following: William Edwards & Co., of Cleveland, Ohio; Plunkett Jarrell Grocery Company, of Little Rock, Ark.; Joseph Barnes and J. S. Hall & Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; W. H. I. Hayes, of Boston, Mass.; Charles Hewitt, C. C. Prouty & Co., and Warfield-Pratt-Howell, Company, of Des Moines, Iowa; Krenning Grocery Company, of St. Louis, Mo.; J. N. Pike Company, of Lynn, Mass.; Isaac Eberly Company, of Columbus, Ohio; F. W. Hannahs, of Newark, N. J.; Buck, Reiner Company and Blom Collier Company, of Keokuk, Iowa; Gustin, Cook & Buckley, of Bay City, Mich.; Reynolds, Davis & Co., of Fort Smith, Ark.; Phipps, Penoyer & Co., of Saginaw, Mich.; Kansas City Wholesale Grocery Company, of Kansas City, Mo.; Deis-Fertig Company, of Canal Dover, Ohio; Imperial Cigar Company, of Scranton, Pa.; Griggs, Cooper & Co., of St. Paul, Minn.; and Marshalltown Grocery Company, of Marshalltown, Iowa—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Colerain, Ohio, for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of Logan, Ohio, favoring the repeal of the Navy personnel act—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEATWOLE: Petitions of citizens of the counties of Nicollet, Lesueur, Sibley, and Scott, Minn., asking for the passage of a bill declaring Minnesota River nonnavigable from its source to the village of Belle Plaine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of M. G. Eneson and others, of St. Peter, Minn., favoring the passage of a graded-service pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Resolutions of the convention of the Western Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, in Kansas City, Mo., for the extension of reciprocal trade arrangements with other countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Independent Tobacco Manufacturers' Association of the United States, favoring the passage of House bill 16457—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of the Brownlow good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Army and Navy Union, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 65—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 14105, giving preference to honorably discharged war veterans in appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MERCER: Resolutions of U. S. Grant Post, No. 110, Grand Army of the Republic, of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against the erection of a statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee in the Capitol or any other Government building in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of the Omaha Central Labor Union, for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. METCALF: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., favoring encouragement of American merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolutions of the Department of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of House bill 14105, giving preference to honorably discharged war veterans in appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of Liberty Lodge, No. 2, Car Workers' Association, of Buffalo, N. Y., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Affidavit to accompany House bill for increase of pension of Jesse Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Central Labor Union, of Omaha, Nebr., for the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of New York Plate Printers' Union, No. 5, urging the passage of House bill 3076, for an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 28, 1903.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. McCUMBER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Journal will stand approved.

WILLIAM E. B. DAVIS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 25th instant, a judgment rendered against the United States by the United States circuit court for the northern district of Alabama in the case of William E. B. Davis, \$332.50; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in further response to a resolution of the 25th instant, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of claimants in Indian depredation cases; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ENTOMOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for entomological investigations for the fiscal year 1903, \$3,013.18; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF JUDGMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in further compliance with the resolution of the 25th instant, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$2,963.04, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting in further compliance with the resolution of the 25th instant, additional lists of claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury amounting to \$8,735.66; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HULL, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. SULZER managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17288) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FOSS, Mr. DAYTON, and Mr. TATE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 304) granting an increase of pension to George M. Duffy;

A bill (H. R. 659) granting an increase of pension to Winfield Pierce;

A bill (H. R. 700) granting an increase of pension to Eben Slawson;

A bill (H. R. 833) granting an increase of pension to George H. Van Deusen;

A bill (H. R. 942) granting a pension to George R. Dougherty;

A bill (H. R. 962) granting a pension to Rodney W. Anderson;

A bill (H. R. 1016) granting a pension to Charles S. F. Hilton;

A bill (H. R. 1062) granting an increase of pension to Elias P. Stearns;

- A bill (H. R. 1087) granting an increase of pension to Matthew W. Lincoln;
 A bill (H. R. 1238) granting a pension to Margaret A. Stuart;
 A bill (H. R. 1257) granting an increase of pension to James F. Campbell;
 A bill (H. R. 1272) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Chilcoat;
 A bill (H. R. 1274) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fleming;
 A bill (H. R. 1422) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Merritt;
 A bill (H. R. 1637) granting an increase of pension to John A. Spalding;
 A bill (H. R. 2199) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jonas Albert;
 A bill (H. R. 2264) granting an increase of pension to George H. Higgins;
 A bill (H. R. 2612) granting a pension to Mary J. Goodrich;
 A bill (H. R. 2787) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia S. Ribble;
 A bill (H. R. 2813) granting an increase of pension to Emily Hawkins;
 A bill (H. R. 2911) granting a pension to Charles M. Walker;
 A bill (H. R. 2913) granting a pension to Catherine A. Sawdy;
 A bill (H. R. 3026) granting a pension to Martha J. Bishop;
 A bill (H. R. 3207) granting a pension to Johanna Buse;
 A bill (H. R. 3213) granting an increase of pension to Belle L. Spaulding;
 A bill (H. R. 3261) granting a pension to George R. Grubaugh;
 A bill (H. R. 3265) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pensinger;
 A bill (H. R. 3353) granting an increase of pension to John H. Kehn;
 A bill (H. R. 3681) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Wilson;
 A bill (H. R. 3752) granting an increase of pension to John E. Pickard;
 A bill (H. R. 4066) granting an increase of pension to Philip Krohn;
 A bill (H. R. 4155) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wend;
 A bill (H. R. 4501) granting a pension to Sarah D. Lightfoot;
 A bill (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Mitchell;
 A bill (H. R. 4632) granting an increase of pension to William P. Rhodes;
 A bill (H. R. 4723) granting a pension to George A. Liston;
 A bill (H. R. 4734) granting a pension to Deborah J. Fogle;
 A bill (H. R. 4740) granting an increase of pension to James E. Wallace;
 A bill (H. R. 4925) granting a pension to Joel Thomason;
 A bill (H. R. 4952) granting a pension to Abner D. Rutherford;
 A bill (H. R. 5010) granting an increase of pension to James W. Pace;
 A bill (H. R. 5028) for the relief of Francis M. Oliver;
 A bill (H. R. 5281) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Mahan;
 A bill (H. R. 5446) granting an increase of pension to James M. Travis;
 A bill (H. R. 5586) granting a pension to Oliver W. Newton;
 A bill (H. R. 5762) granting an increase of pension to William H. T. Hostetler;
 A bill (H. R. 5876) granting an increase of pension to Jacob E. Richards;
 A bill (H. R. 5907) granting a pension to David S. Taylor;
 A bill (H. R. 5960) granting an increase of pension to Lambert Johnston;
 A bill (H. R. 5982) granting an increase of pension to Christine B. Knapp;
 A bill (H. R. 6065) granting an increase of pension to James Garland;
 A bill (H. R. 6101) granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. McQuiddy;
 A bill (H. R. 6127) granting an increase of pension to Catherine P. McLorinen;
 A bill (H. R. 6189) granting an increase of pension to Eli Potts;
 A bill (H. R. 6442) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Gifford;
 A bill (H. R. 6470) granting an increase of pension to Shepherd H. King;
 A bill (H. R. 6498) granting an increase of pension to John A. Whitman;
 A bill (H. R. 6593) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Graham;
 A bill (H. R. 6617) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Cool;
 A bill (H. R. 6656) granting a pension to Samantha Yant;
 A bill (H. R. 6719) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hall;
 A bill (H. R. 6724) granting an increase of pension to Julia Stillwell;
 A bill (H. R. 6876) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Faught;
 A bill (H. R. 6969) granting a pension to Visa C. Morrill;
 A bill (H. R. 7308) granting an increase of pension to Mary Morley;
 A bill (H. R. 7312) granting an increase of pension to James Curley;
 A bill (H. R. 7367) granting a pension to Ellen D. Campbell;
 A bill (H. R. 7510) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Gammon;
 A bill (H. R. 7708) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Fallon;
 A bill (H. R. 7710) granting a pension to Margaret Scanlon;
 A bill (H. R. 7736) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Allen;
 A bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Graham;
 A bill (H. R. 7832) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lister;
 A bill (H. R. 7844) granting a pension to Alonzo Pendland;
 A bill (H. R. 7895) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Bowen;
 A bill (H. R. 8005) granting a pension to Samantha A. Newcomb;
 A bill (H. R. 8023) granting an increase of pension to John Downing;
 A bill (H. R. 8061) granting a pension to Frances E. Wild;
 A bill (H. R. 8085) granting an increase of pension to David K. Wardwell;
 A bill (H. R. 8165) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Peck;
 A bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to William T. Moore;
 A bill (H. R. 8244) granting a pension to Bridget Logan;
 A bill (H. R. 8314) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Kauffman;
 A bill (H. R. 8711) granting an increase of pension to William C. Crawford;
 A bill (H. R. 8812) granting an increase of pension to Henry Staff;
 A bill (H. R. 9154) granting an increase of pension to Lillie V. Ball;
 A bill (H. R. 9237) granting a pension to John Wallace;
 A bill (H. R. 9274) granting a pension to Jessie V. Cluxton;
 A bill (H. R. 9491) granting an increase of pension to John W. Brattain;
 A bill (H. R. 9570) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Gabrion;
 A bill (H. R. 9799) granting an increase of pension to Mary Murphy;
 A bill (H. R. 9912) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Smith;
 A bill (H. R. 10505) granting a pension to Mabel A. Woolsey;
 A bill (H. R. 10506) granting a pension to Francis E. Luse;
 A bill (H. R. 10691) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Van Wie;
 A bill (H. R. 10760) granting a pension to Wallace L. Scott;
 A bill (H. R. 10869) granting an increase of pension to Michael K. Strayer;
 A bill (H. R. 10922) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Feldhausen;
 A bill (H. R. 11020) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Alsbach;
 A bill (H. R. 11075) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Hart;
 A bill (H. R. 11122) granting an increase of pension to John W. Corley;
 A bill (H. R. 11189) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Gilbert;
 A bill (H. R. 11371) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Heiskell;
 A bill (H. R. 11388) granting a pension to William Vogan;
 A bill (H. R. 11428) granting an increase of pension to Plummer Lewis;
 A bill (H. R. 11546) granting a pension to Edward Bryan;
 A bill (H. R. 11616) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Harris;
 A bill (H. R. 11625) granting an increase of pension to Alexander H. Taylor;
 A bill (H. R. 11682) granting a pension to Mary E. Winterbottom;

- A bill (H. R. 11701) granting an increase of pension to John C. Wright;
- A bill (H. R. 11739) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Northway;
- A bill (H. R. 11833) granting an increase of pension to Albanis F. Anderson;
- A bill (H. R. 11958) granting a pension to Henry H. Windes;
- A bill (H. R. 12021) granting an increase of pension to Anson Lewis;
- A bill (H. R. 12090) granting a pension to Arvilla N. Stocker;
- A bill (H. R. 12322) granting an increase of pension to William F. Wilcox;
- A bill (H. R. 12332) granting an increase of pension to William Sands;
- A bill (H. R. 12492) granting an increase of pension to Callie West;
- A bill (H. R. 12602) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Burke;
- A bill (H. R. 12611) granting a pension to Alexander J. Thompson;
- A bill (H. R. 12638) granting an increase of pension to John W. Day;
- A bill (H. R. 12771) granting a pension to William Kenny;
- A bill (H. R. 12822) granting an increase of pension to Michael O. Sullivan;
- A bill (H. R. 12841) granting an increase of pension to William King;
- A bill (H. R. 13004) granting an increase of pension to Peter B. Rouch;
- A bill (H. R. 13046) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Ludlum;
- A bill (H. R. 13316) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Olcott;
- A bill (H. R. 13323) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Barger;
- A bill (H. R. 13485) granting a pension to Louisa Josephine Stanwood;
- A bill (H. R. 13605) for the relief of George A. Detchemendy;
- A bill (H. R. 13612) granting a pension to Margaret Bell;
- A bill (H. R. 13634) granting an increase of pension to Helen Olivia Leckie;
- A bill (H. R. 13701) granting a pension to Theodore Buri;
- A bill (H. R. 13705) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Garrison;
- A bill (H. R. 13711) granting a pension to Simon M. Yates;
- A bill (H. R. 13713) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Randolph;
- A bill (H. R. 13719) granting a pension to Nancy McGuire;
- A bill (H. R. 13723) granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Jackson;
- A bill (H. R. 13772) granting an increase of pension to Marcus L. Vermillion;
- A bill (H. R. 13793) granting an increase of pension to Solomon A. Alexander;
- A bill (H. R. 13881) granting a pension to William M. Wilson;
- A bill (H. R. 13945) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Durant;
- A bill (H. R. 14027) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Winfrey;
- A bill (H. R. 14091) granting a pension to Charles A. Warrick;
- A bill (H. R. 14160) granting an increase of pension to Ira J. S. Holmes;
- A bill (H. R. 14217) granting an increase of pension to George M. Smith;
- A bill (H. R. 14235) granting an increase of pension to George White;
- A bill (H. R. 14236) granting an increase of pension to William C. Chatfield;
- A bill (H. R. 14263) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Journal;
- A bill (H. R. 14361) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Alexander;
- A bill (H. R. 14439) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Peale;
- A bill (H. R. 14448) granting an increase of pension to James M. Cartmill;
- A bill (H. R. 14475) granting an increase of pension to David E. Lawton;
- A bill (H. R. 14758) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Talbott;
- A bill (H. R. 14788) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Hills;
- A bill (H. R. 14813) granting a pension to William Menecke;
- A bill (H. R. 14929) granting an increase of pension to John Keen;
- A bill (H. R. 14930) granting an increase of pension to William H. Houseal;
- A bill (H. R. 14938) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Wilson;
- A bill (H. R. 15038) granting an increase of pension to Lucy T. Churchill;
- A bill (H. R. 15186) granting an increase of pension to Isaac J. Nichols;
- A bill (H. R. 15362) granting an increase of pension to Grace Harrington;
- A bill (H. R. 15387) granting an increase of pension to Lott Van Nordstrand;
- A bill (H. R. 15403) granting an increase of pension to Milton C. Norton;
- A bill (H. R. 15404) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hattery;
- A bill (H. R. 15422) granting an increase of pension to John Mosgrove;
- A bill (H. R. 15423) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Morehouse;
- A bill (H. R. 15431) granting an increase of pension to Elias Simpson;
- A bill (H. R. 15440) granting an increase of pension to John Fullerton;
- A bill (H. R. 15443) granting a pension to Eudora Wells;
- A bill (H. R. 15466) granting an increase of pension to John H. Robson;
- A bill (H. R. 15528) granting an increase of pension to John C. William;
- A bill (H. R. 15533) granting an increase of pension to William H. France;
- A bill (H. R. 15558) granting an increase of pension to David A. Baldwin;
- A bill (H. R. 15573) granting a pension to Cynthia Thomas;
- A bill (H. R. 15617) granting an increase of pension to William Keith;
- A bill (H. R. 15618) granting an increase of pension to William O. Boughton;
- A bill (H. R. 15619) granting an increase of pension to Charles Strong, alias William Clark;
- A bill (H. R. 15629) granting an increase of pension to Edward Tattersall;
- A bill (H. R. 15636) granting a pension to Matilda Tunison;
- A bill (H. R. 15645) granting an increase of pension to Wilson French;
- A bill (H. R. 15665) granting an increase of pension to John H. Carr;
- A bill (H. R. 15674) granting an increase of pension to John A. T. McPherson;
- A bill (H. R. 15688) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Williams;
- A bill (H. R. 15696) granting an increase of pension to Milton D. Wells;
- A bill (H. R. 15721) granting an increase of pension to Walter A. Porter;
- A bill (H. R. 15730) granting an increase of pension to Hans A. Grove;
- A bill (H. R. 15733) granting an increase of pension to Martin G. Cole;
- A bill (H. R. 15735) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wheeler;
- A bill (H. R. 15746) granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Lucas;
- A bill (H. R. 15748) granting an increase of pension to William Whitlock;
- A bill (H. R. 15793) granting an increase of pension to George Skinner;
- A bill (H. R. 15812) granting an increase of pension to Lucien B. Love;
- A bill (H. R. 15842) granting a pension to Mary H. Talcott;
- A bill (H. R. 15843) granting an increase of pension to Louis W. Rowe;
- A bill (H. R. 15873) granting a pension to Minerva Murphy;
- A bill (H. R. 15894) granting an increase of pension to Lewis P. Everett;
- A bill (H. R. 15906) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grennue;
- A bill (H. R. 15915) granting an increase of pension to Frank Stafford;
- A bill (H. R. 15962) granting a pension to Catharine T. R. Matthews;
- A bill (H. R. 15964) granting an increase of pension to Michael Murphy;
- A bill (H. R. 16000) granting an increase of pension to John H. Amadon;
- A bill (H. R. 16048) granting an increase of pension to John Graham;
- A bill (H. R. 16073) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 16077) granting a pension to Leighton M. Pervell, alias Charles H. Hunt;
 A bill (H. R. 16201) granting an increase of pension to Jeffrey Hufford;
 A bill (H. R. 16210) granting an increase of pension to John C. Collahan;
 A bill (H. R. 16212) granting an increase of pension to Sanders W. Johnston;
 A bill (H. R. 16275) granting a pension to Isaac B. Price;
 A bill (H. R. 16291) granting a pension to Laban McGahan;
 A bill (H. R. 16309) granting a pension to Samuel H. Montanye;
 A bill (H. R. 16313) granting an increase of pension to James L. Davenport, alias Dexter Davis;
 A bill (H. R. 16314) granting an increase of pension to Richard S. Howarth;
 A bill (H. R. 16344) granting a pension to Lucinda Lawrence;
 A bill (H. R. 16351) granting an increase of pension to Austin P. Merrell;
 A bill (H. R. 16352) to amend the act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Mary La Tourette Stotsenburg," approved June 2, 1900;
 A bill (H. R. 16353) granting an increase of pension to William F. Ritchie;
 A bill (H. R. 16361) granting an increase of pension to John W. Chancellor;
 A bill (H. R. 16364) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Carney;
 A bill (H. R. 16368) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Hutchinson;
 A bill (H. R. 16374) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo S. Bowden;
 A bill (H. R. 16381) granting an increase of pension to Lymus Wallace;
 A bill (H. R. 16391) granting a pension to Ella F. Shandrew;
 A bill (H. R. 16419) granting an increase of pension to James Harrison;
 A bill (H. R. 16423) granting an increase of pension to Eliza B. Abbott;
 A bill (H. R. 16445) granting an increase of pension to John E. McDonald;
 A bill (H. R. 16476) granting a pension to Catherine Rayel;
 A bill (H. R. 16538) granting an increase of pension to William W. Downs;
 A bill (H. R. 16667) granting an increase of pension to Leroy N. Buell;
 A bill (H. R. 16696) granting an increase of pension to Freling H. Amick;
 A bill (H. R. 16697) granting a pension to Ellen Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 16714) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. F. Gilmore;
 A bill (H. R. 16717) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Thompson;
 A bill (H. R. 16752) granting a pension to Anton Sauthoff;
 A bill (H. R. 16754) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hughes;
 A bill (H. R. 16755) granting an increase of pension to Fannie T. Fisher;
 A bill (H. R. 16756) granting an increase of pension to John Brown;
 A bill (H. R. 16784) granting an increase of pension to Michael Howe;
 A bill (H. R. 16785) granting an increase of pension to Collins W. Wight;
 A bill (H. R. 16786) granting an increase of pension to John C. Sautter;
 A bill (H. R. 16787) granting an increase of pension to Richard G. Hanscom;
 A bill (H. R. 16856) granting an increase of pension to John Burke;
 A bill (H. R. 16857) granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Kile;
 A bill (H. R. 16858) granting an increase of pension to James P. Foster;
 A bill (H. R. 16859) granting a pension to Florence M. Stout;
 A bill (H. R. 16929) granting an increase of pension to William H. Trites;
 A bill (H. R. 16939) granting an increase of pension to Alexander T. Sullenger, alias Alexander Patillo;
 A bill (H. R. 16996) granting an increase of pension to John Bougher;
 A bill (H. R. 17043) granting a pension to Martha Maddox;
 A bill (H. R. 17090) granting an increase of pension to James T. Price;
 A bill (H. R. 17093) granting a pension to Caroline Schaefer;
 A bill (H. R. 17094) granting an increase of pension to Augustus L. Kidder;

A bill (H. R. 17101) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Glazer;
 A bill (H. R. 17110) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Tracy;
 A bill (H. R. 17119) granting an increase of pension to James Flanagan;
 A bill (H. R. 17120) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shirar;
 A bill (H. R. 17133) granting a pension to Kathinka Sichel;
 A bill (H. R. 17179) granting an increase of pension to Christopher G. Divers;
 A bill (H. R. 17233) granting a pension to John Haynes;
 A bill (H. R. 17234) granting an increase of pension to David Flynn;
 A bill (H. R. 17296) granting an increase of pension to Newton Thayer;
 A bill (H. R. 17297) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Fox;
 A bill (H. R. 17298) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Smith;
 A bill (H. R. 17303) granting an increase of pension to Abraham W. Huffman;
 A bill (H. R. 17305) granting a pension to Philander H. Graves; and
 A bill (H. R. 17306) granting a pension to Catherine McGuinn.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Absaraka, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the States power to deal with intoxicating liquors which may be shipped into their territory from other States; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a petition of Lakeside Council, No. 6, Daughters of Liberty, of Laconia, N. H., praying for the passage of the immigration bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Epping, N. H., and the petition of B. W. Kilburn and C. S. Kilburn, of Littleton, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the States power to deal with intoxicating liquors which may be shipped into their territory from other States; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Boot and Shoemakers' Union, No. 331, American Federation of Labor, of Keene, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the giving of presents, coupons, or promises of gifts with cigars or tobaccos; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented memorial of the Cigarmakers' Local Union, No. 54, American Federation of Labor, of Evansville, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of the pending Cuban reciprocity treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Boot and Shoemakers' Local Union, No. 331, American Federation of Labor, of Keene, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the giving of presents, coupons, or promises of gifts with cigars and tobaccos; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCOMAS presented a petition of Local Union No. 276, Brotherhood of Boiler Makers and Iron Ship Builders, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of the so-called ship-subsidy bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of James Seldon Cowdon, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish capital punishment; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 180, International Association of Machinists, of North Platte, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURROWS. I present a memorial in the matter of Reed Smoot, Senator-elect from the State of Utah. I move that the memorial be placed on the files of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DUBOIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Latah County, Idaho, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Quarles bill to repeal the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ALGER. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the commemoration of the semicentennial anniversary of the commencement of the construction of a ship canal between Lake Huron and Lake Superior, at the falls of St. Marys River, in

that State. I ask that the concurrent resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, LANSING.

I, George Lord, deputy secretary of state of the State of Michigan, hereby certify that the attached copy of concurrent resolution approved February 12, 1903, is a true and correct transcript of the original, which is on file in the Department of State.

In witness whereof I have hereto affixed my signature and the great seal of the State at Lansing, this 25th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1903.
[SEAL.]

GEORGE LORD,
Deputy Secretary of State.

Senate, enrolled No. 8, concurrent resolution. By Mr. Fuller.

Whereas the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of work on the ship canal and locks at the falls of the St. Marys River, between Lake Huron and Lake Superior, occurs June 4, 1903; and

Whereas the construction of this waterway was one of the most important events of the nineteenth century in the development of the internal commerce of the United States; and

Whereas the tonnage passing through the St. Marys Canal shows it to be one of the most important waterways in the world, and it has, in its half century of history, proven one of the greatest aids to the great industrial development of the world, and it has contributed as much as anything to the growth and prosperity of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the senate and house of representatives of the State of Michigan hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass House joint resolution No. 144, now pending before that body, to provide for the commemoration of a semicentennial anniversary of the commencement of the construction of the ship canal between Lake Huron and Lake Superior, at the falls of the St. Marys River, in the State of Michigan, occurring June 4, 1903; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Michigan be requested and urged to do everything in their power to secure the passage of this House joint resolution No. 144; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Michigan; and be it further

Resolved, That the governor of the State is hereby authorized and directed to extend in the name of the State of Michigan an invitation through the governors thereof to the other States bordering on the Great Lakes, namely, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, to appoint commissioners and to actively participate in the arrangements for and in carrying out of the plans of this celebration; this invitation to convey information of the action of the State of Michigan toward the proper celebration of this event.

ALEXANDER MAITLAND,
President of the Senate.
JOHN J. CARTON,
Speaker of the House.

Approved.

AARON T. BLISS,
Governor.

RED LAKE RESERVATION IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask that 1,500 copies of the act for the opening of a portion of the diminished Red Lake Reservation in the State of Minnesota be printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks that a certain number of copies of an act for the opening of a portion of the diminished Red Lake Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, be printed for the use of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4772) to fix the salary of the collector of customs at Omaha, Nebr., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 17493) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for prior years, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments; and I submit a report thereon. I give notice that I shall ask the Senate at the earliest opportunity to take up the bill for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. From the Committee on Military Affairs, I submit a report touching sundry brevet nominations which were sent to the Senate in the first session of this Congress, during which the committee was not able to prepare a statement and report prior to its adjournment, when the nominations were returned to the President, and have not been made at this session and no formal action can be taken by the Senate. I move that the report be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3420) granting a pension to Anna O. Brush; and

A bill (H. R. 17026) granting a pension to Jerome W. Turner.

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I report from the Committee on Printing a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare and have issued a special edition of the Congressional Directory for

the use of the special session of the Senate, should one be called, and that said edition be ready on the first day of the session, and that the same compensation be allowed for the compiling and editing of said edition as is authorized by law for the regular edition, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the resolution be read again. The Secretary again read the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the impression of the Chair that the resolution must go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as it provides for an appropriation from the contingent fund.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I move that it be referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I was about to say one word with regard to the resolution. It is a very unusual resolution, and I do not wish by vote to anticipate a called session of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALDRICH submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$960 to pay Harry A. Nelson for extra service as mail messenger in the Senate post-office from July 1, 1900, to March 1, 1903, inclusive, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORAKER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,574.19 in settlement No. 5201 of 1885, in favor of the Eureka Fire and Marine Insurance Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, etc.; \$1,744.52 in settlement No. 5201 of 1885, in favor of the Citizens' Insurance Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, etc.; \$1,744.52 in settlement No. 5201 of 1885, in favor of the American Insurance Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, etc.; \$2,887.10 in settlement No. 5201 of 1885, in favor of the Magnolia Fire and Marine Insurance Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, etc., and \$2,287.10 in settlement No. 5201 of 1885, in favor of the City Insurance Company of Cincinnati, Ohio, etc.; intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COURTS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. BAILEY. I move that the House be requested to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 16775) establishing United States courts at Duncan, Maryetta, and Comanche, Ind. T. I will state that my purpose is to move to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, in order that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] may have an opportunity to offer an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM JENNEY.

On motion of Mr. BURROWS, it was

Ordered, That the papers accompanying Senate bill 6870, granting a pension to William Jenney, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate and returned to the beneficiary, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to call up a bill as soon as the morning business is finished.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia rise to morning business?

Mr. BACON. It is in the nature of morning business. I wish to submit an amendment to what is known as the antitrust bill. I ask that it be printed and that it be read, simply that it may be spread upon the record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. BACON to the bill (H. R. 17) entitled "An act requiring corporations engaged in interstate commerce to make returns, prohibiting rebates and discriminations and the use of interstate commerce in attempt to destroy competition, and for other purposes," as reported with amendments from the Committee on the Judiciary February 17, 1903.

Amend section 1, page 4, of the proposed amended bill by striking out the words beginning on page 18 and ending on line 22, as follows:

"Any corporation failing to make such return or whose treasurer or other officer shall fail to make the answers aforesaid may be restrained, on the suit of the United States, from engaging in interstate commerce until such return is made."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Any corporation or officer of the same violating the provisions of this section, or refusing to comply with the requirements therein made, shall for every such act forfeit to the United States the sum of \$5,000, to be recovered as in other cases of penalties."

Amend further by striking out the amendment proposed by the committee, which is named in said bill as section 5, and is found on pages 8, 9, and 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. That no corporation engaged in interstate commerce shall, in the prosecution of such interstate commerce, attempt to monopolize the sale of any article in any State, by discriminations made for such purpose, or by giving special privileges or rebates, or by making any agreement with, or imposing any condition upon, the purchaser or his agent in restraint of trade in said article, or by any other device in order to prevent or hinder competition therein with respect to such article. Every corporation or the officer or agent of such corporation violating the provisions of this section, shall be punished for every such act on conviction by a fine of not less than \$500 and not exceeding \$5,000."

Amend further by striking from said bill the amendment proposed by the committee which is numbered section 6, and which is found on pages 10, 11, and 12 of said bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it is due to myself to say that notice of these amendments was given by me to the Committee on the Judiciary at the time the bill was reported from the committee. On account of the shortness of the time and the desire for prompt action on the part of the committee, I was unable, although the effort was made by me, to then frame satisfactory amendments; and I agreed that the committee should report the bill with a reservation on my part, as members of the committee who are now present will remember, of the right to offer these amendments in the Senate.

I desire to state in one word the object of the amendments I now offer. I am in thorough sympathy with the desire to have legislation which will prevent monopoly and correct and control, as far as practicable, all those things which hinder competition. At the same time I am not willing to adopt the particular method of prevention which was reported by the committee in the amended bill, to wit, the prohibition by Congressional act of interstate commerce in any article of legitimate commerce. I am not prepared myself to recognize as a legal proposition that the power exists in Congress to prohibit interstate commerce in such articles, and if such power does exist I am unwilling to invoke it.

I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of the amended bill to prevent monopoly. I wish to accomplish the same things which the bill seeks to accomplish, but I think there are other penalties which can be made effectual without in any manner impairing what I consider to be important rights of the States, and I have in these amendments proposed such other penalties. I am not willing that there should be an invasion of this serious character of what I regard to be their fundamental rights—the invasion of the right of the people of one State to sell to the people of another State. Not only so, but I am not willing that by act of Congress the right of production should be limited and controlled in any State. I am also very firmly of the opinion that each State has the right and should continue to have the right to decide what should be the corporate organization and the corporate powers of the corporations created in such State, and that the Federal Government has not the power and should not have the power to invade the rights of the States in this regard.

For these reasons, thus briefly stated, I have felt constrained to offer these amendments to the amended bill proposed by the committee. These penalties included in the amendments offered by me are very heavy, and if they are enforced by the courts they will go a long way in preventing monopoly.

I will add further, Mr. President, that I would have added as an amendment also a provision which would have looked to the reasonable reduction of the tariff upon trust-made articles, at least to the point where, if there should be exorbitant charges, there could be reasonable foreign competition with those articles in this country. I have refrained from doing so, though, in the opinion that such legislation could not properly originate in the Senate.

NOTING OF OBJECTIONS TO BILLS.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a minute?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish to make a suggestion about the business of the Senate. There are a number of bills upon the Calendar to which different Senators are opposed. We are all engaged more or less in committee work and on conference committees, and are necessarily detained from the Senate Chamber and can not be here all the time.

There ought to be some way by which the rights of Senators could be preserved in cases of that sort. I have noticed in some instances the fact that Senators are opposed to bills, and are not willing that unanimous consent shall be granted for their being taken up and passed, has been noted on the backs of the bills by the clerks. I should like to have it understood that it shall be the duty of the Chair, in such cases, to notify the Senate, whenever unanimous consent is asked for the passage of a bill and a Senator has noted on the back of the bill an objection to its consideration by unanimous consent, so that, in case the Senator should be absent from the Senate, the Senate would be advised and he might be sent for and have an opportunity to be heard before a bill shall have passed by unanimous consent to which there is objection.

I ask the consent of the Senate that that may be the order of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURTON. I did not quite understand the Senator from Arkansas. That does not preclude a motion to take up a bill to which objection has been made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas is, simply, that if any Senator who is to be absent from the Chamber objects to the consideration of a bill he may give a notice to the clerks, so that the Presiding Officer, when the bill is called up, may inform the Senate of the fact that such a Senator had entered an objection to it.

AMERICAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE AT PARIS.

Mr. TILLMAN. Three days ago a bill was called up to which I objected at the time, and therefore it did not pass. After conference with its friends, and a somewhat better understanding of it, I wish to call it up this morning and suggest some amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 7368) to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France, may receive consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has been read. If there be no objection, it is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to offer some amendments. On page 1, I move to strike out in lines 3 and 4 the words:

The Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, all ex officio, and.

Mr. QUARLES. May we have the title of the bill read, so that we can understand what it is?

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 7368) to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will state for the information of the Senate that this is a bill to provide in Paris an institution in the way of a home, a clubroom, and other quarters for American students who are there studying music, art, and other cognate branches of learning and science. The objection which I have to the bill, and which other Senators had, will be noted if Senators will get a copy of the bill. We did not want to have the United States Government associated with this institution in any manner or responsible for it other than to create a corporation which may receive donations and subscriptions, and have a continuing life rather than that it shall be merely a partnership or arrangement by individuals.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is due to say that I think this matter was brought before the Committee on Appropriations some years ago and it was turned down emphatically. I have sent for the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. They are familiar with it. I think the matter was brought up at this session.

Mr. TILLMAN. It was brought up a few days ago, and I objected to it myself because of the fact that it contained a hint at an appropriation. I propose to strike out everything in the bill which squints toward making it an appendage or a department or to place it in any connection whatever with the Government, leaving it entirely a private venture, similar to the bill we passed a week or two ago in regard to a similar institution in Rome. I have in my hand Senate bill 4980, to incorporate the American Academy at Rome, and I want to have this bill conform as nearly as practicable to the same scheme.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have the Senator from Iowa present. If the amendments are made which the Senator indicates, I do not know that there will be any objection to it. I have sent for the Senator from Iowa. Let the Senator from South Carolina move his amendments.

Mr. TILLMAN. If Senators will get a copy of Senate bill 7368 they can keep track of the amendments. I move to strike out, in lines 3 and 4, on the first page, the words:

The Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, all ex officio, and.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. In line 6 I move strike out "Von Daner" and to insert "von Daur." That is a committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. In line 7, after "Mrs.," I move to strike out "W. A." and insert "Sarah Elizabeth;" so as to read, "Mrs. Sarah Elizabeth Henderson." That is also a committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. In line 11, after the word "Cary," I move to insert "Agassiz;" which is likewise a committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then on page 3 I move to strike out section 6, in the following words:

SEC. 6. That no moneys appropriated by the Congress of the United States of America for the benefit of said corporation shall be drawn from the Treasury of the United States except upon joint draft of two of the above-named ex officio incorporators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to strike out section 9, in the following words:

SEC. 9. That in case of the discontinuance of the institute in Paris, or the dissolution of the corporation, all the property of the corporation, of whatever

description, in the regents thereof, which at the inception of the corporation shall consist of the above-named incorporators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. Those are all the amendments I wish to offer.

Mr. HALE. What bill is this?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is the bill to incorporate the American National Institute at Paris.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from Maine will allow me to explain—

Mr. HALE. I wish to state that the bill came up the other day and I entered a very serious objection to it. I do not want to have it passed until I can have a full opportunity to examine it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read now as it has been amended.

Mr. HALE. Yes; I have no objection to that, but I have no time to examine it to-day, and I ask the Senator to let it go over for a day. Ordinarily, where a Senator has made an objection to a bill—

Mr. TILLMAN. I objected. The Senator merely stated his objections in speaking. I objected to its consideration and threw it overboard. Now, I have considered it, and I have conferred with those who understand its meaning, and I am trying to make it conform to a similar act which we have already passed in regard to such an institute in Rome. I want to divorce the Government from it in every possible shape, form, and fashion, and I have done so by the amendments which I have offered, and which have been agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to the bill being read as amended, and then I shall ask that it may go over until I can have an opportunity to examine it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the Senator ask that it be printed and lie over.

Mr. HALE. Let it be printed as amended.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be printed as amended.

Mr. COCKRELL. Retaining its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. I wish to say further that if the bill is put right, and I find that it is, and that all the objections I have, which are against the Government ever being called upon to contribute to this institution, have been removed, I shall not ask that it be delayed even until to-morrow. I will examine the bill, and if I find that it is all right as amended, it may be called up during the day. But I do want to be certain that the feature of Government liability is stricken out.

The bill as amended is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Chauncey M. Depew, Thomas Hunter, Edward Walpole Warren, John D. Crimmins, Henri von Daur, Candace Wheeler, Mrs. Sarah Elizabeth Henderson, Sarah E. Buckbee, and Matilda Smedley, all of the city, county, and State of New York, and Joshua L. Chamberlain, who resides at Brunswick, in the State of Maine; Mrs. Elizabeth Cary Agassiz, who resides in Cambridge, Mass., their associates and successors, are hereby created a body corporate and politic in the District of Columbia, by the name of the American National Institute in Paris, France, with the right to plead and be pleaded, to adopt a constitution, by-laws, and corporate seal. The objects of this corporation are to construct a building in said city of Paris, and there to provide favorable conditions of surroundings and direction for American students, to be admitted, under proper certificates of examination of fitness, by competition, and to facilitate their studies and training in the arts and sciences, including architecture, sculpture, painting, applied design, music, dramatic art, literature, and languages.

SEC. 2. That said corporation is hereby empowered to acquire property, both real and personal, by deed, lease, devise, subscription, purchase, gift, or by any other lawful means in the United States and in Paris, France; and, in particular, is empowered to succeed to the rights and to take over, hold, and administer all the property of the American National Institute (Prix de Paris), a corporation heretofore incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, including all its scholarships, subscriptions, bequests, gifts, and pledges, and ground conceded by the municipality of the city of Paris, France.

SEC. 3. That the management and direction of all the affairs of said corporation shall be vested in the board of regents thereof, which at the inception of the corporation shall consist of the above-named incorporators.

SEC. 4. That the board of regents shall have power, upon unanimous consent of the ex officio members, to add to its number and to fill any vacancy which may occur therein by reason of death, resignation, or disability.

SEC. 5. That the board of regents shall determine the times and places of its meetings and shall determine the number, tenure, duties, and salaries of the officers, committees, and agents of the corporation.

SEC. 6. That said corporation shall be unsectarian in its management.

SEC. 7. That the president or chief officer of said corporation shall render to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, whenever thereto required, a written report of the assets and liabilities of said corporation at date of such report.

SEC. 8. That said corporation or board of regents may send each year to the Library of Congress, or such place as may be decided upon, such works of the students of the institute as may be agreed upon between the jurors of the American National Institute and the board of regents as suitable for preservation and exhibition.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, and requesting a confer-

ence with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and grant the request of the House for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. WARREN, Mr. ALGER, and Mr. PETTUS were appointed.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17288) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, and asking for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives and agree to the conference asked by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HALE, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. TILLMAN were appointed.

LANDS IN LEE COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16069) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands therein mentioned.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 27th instant approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

An act (S. 6515) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C.;

An act (S. 7223) providing for the interment of the remains of Marie Irene Donaldson and her daughter, Marie Irene Donaldson; and

The joint resolution (S. R. 159) granting to the New York and Jersey Railroad Company the right to construct and operate an underground railway under land owned by the United States in the city of New York.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 4825) to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17046) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read, and that the amendments proposed by the committee be considered as they are reached in their order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments shall first receive consideration. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Fortifications and other works of defense," on page 2, line 4, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to purchase land on Cushing's Island, Portland Harbor, Maine, for which appropriation was made in the act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, etc., approved June 6, 1902, at such times and in such parcels and quantity as may appear to him to be for the best interests of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 21, to insert:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to apply the money herein appropriated under the heading "Fortifications and other works of defense" in carrying on the various works, by contract or otherwise, as may be most economical and advantageous to the Government. Where said works are done by contract, such contract shall be made after sufficient public advertisement for proposals, in such manner and form as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and such contracts shall be made with the lowest responsible bidders, accompanied by such securities as the Secretary of War shall require, conditioned for the faithful prosecution and completion of the work according to such contract.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Armament of fortifications," on page 5, line 24, to increase the appropriation for 8, 10, and 12 inch guns manufactured by contract under the provisions of the fortifications acts, approved August 18, 1890, and February 24, 1891, from \$145,000 to \$199,473.23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 5 on page 7.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to amend the bill by striking out the last paragraph read, in the following words:

For steel breech-loading field guns and their carriages, including sights, implements, equipments, etc., \$265,000.

And inserting in lieu thereof:

For purchase, manufacture, alterations, and repair of steel breech-loading field guns and their carriages, including sights, implements, equipments, and tools or machinery necessary for their manufacture at arsenals, \$265,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Board of Ordnance and Fortification," on page 10, after line 13, to insert:

A. H. EMERY ELEVATING CARRIAGE.

To enable A. H. Emery to complete and erect the 12-inch elevating carriage he is building for the Government the Secretary of War, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to increase the contract price of such carriage and its foundations from \$150,000 to \$190,000; and to enable the Secretary of War to make this increase in the price of this work and to make payment therefor the sum of \$40,000 is hereby appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading of the bill has been concluded.

Mr. RAWLINS. I should like to ask the Senator from California the total amount of the appropriations made by the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. The estimate made by the Government in its Book of Estimates was \$15,004,420; the supplemental estimate was \$230,500, making a total of \$15,235,320. The bill as it passed the House and came to the Senate amounted to \$7,093,943. The Senate Committee on Appropriations have increased this amount \$94,473.22, making the amount appropriated by the bill as it now stands \$7,188,416.22, or less than 50 per cent, about 47 per cent, of the estimates made by the Government.

Mr. RAWLINS. I should like to ask the Senator if any estimate has been made in relation to the fortification and protection of the interoceanic canal which is in contemplation at this time?

Mr. PERKINS. None has been embodied in the bill for that purpose.

Mr. RAWLINS. I will ask the Senator if he understands that any appropriation in the future will be necessary for that purpose?

Mr. PERKINS. That is a question for Congress in its wisdom to determine. Mr. President, your committee only considered the questions submitted to them, as to the appropriations for our fortifications and emplacements for guns, to mount and properly defend our coast ports and to have in store rapid-fire guns, Gatling guns, mortars, and other reserve stock.

There was a proposition made, I will say, to appropriate of the million and a half that was asked for \$500,000 for foundations and emplacements for our insular possessions; but your committee believed that this was not an opportune time to consider it, and therefore they declined to accept the amendment as recommended by the Chief of Engineers through the Secretary of War.

Mr. RAWLINS. I should like to ask the Senator if any appropriation is made in the bill for fortification or other means of defense in the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. PERKINS. None is embodied in this bill. I think under the general provision of the law the Secretary of War could direct the sending of guns to the Hawaiian Islands or to Alaska or any other of our possessions, but no specific appropriation is made in this bill for any of the insular possessions of the United States.

Mr. RAWLINS. As the Senator is very familiar with this subject, I should like to ask him one other question. In his opinion, resulting from such investigation as he, as chairman of this subcommittee, has made upon the subject, does the Senator believe that there can or will be any expenditure made by the Government of the United States with a view to the protection or fortification of the canal which it is proposed by pending treaties and otherwise shall be constructed?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I have no authority whatever to speak on the part of the committee, for they have never given any expression on the subject. My own judgment, however, is that the best fortification that the country can have is that of neutrality. That is the strongest fortification, because it has the defense of every maritime country of the world.

I call to the mind of my friend from Utah the fact that Switzerland and Belgium are the strongest fortified countries in Europe or in the world to-day, and that neither one of them has a fort or a gun mounted upon an embattlement. It is because the great powers of Europe have agreed that there shall be neutrality in Switzerland and Belgium, and, although the capital of one of

those countries is but a few miles from Waterloo, where the great battle was fought, there has not been a hostile shot fired upon that neutral land in fifty or sixty years or more. I believe it is wisdom on the part of this Government if we construct the isthmian canal to have it neutral, and then we shall have the cooperation, the support, and the defense of every nation of the world.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator correctly, he stated that the committee had made no appropriation in this bill for the fortification or defense of the Philippine Islands. Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, sir; I so understand it.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, in this connection, without a desire to detain the Senate at length, there are some considerations to which I think the attention of the Senate ought to be invited.

I am not one of those who have favored the ratification of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, nor am I in favor—I may perhaps express now without impropriety—of the ratification of the pending treaty, to which some attention is being given by the Senate. As I shall not have an opportunity to give the reasons why I have assumed this attitude in the past, I desire to do it at the present time as briefly and as concisely as I can.

The Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] has compared the Panama Canal, if it shall be constructed under the scheme which is now under consideration, to Switzerland. He says that the nations of Europe have guaranteed the neutrality of that country, and that for fifty years that has been ample protection. I suppose his inference is that if under the present arrangement the isthmian canal is constructed, it will have a sufficient protection in the guaranty of all nations for its neutralization.

The Senator from California by this admission concedes that the United States alone is not to have control of the canal, and that it is to be maintained in accordance with the principle of neutralization embodied in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and reaffirmed and continued in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. I have those treaties before me. The second article of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which has been ratified by the Senate and is now, of course, a law and has full publicity, prescribes the conditions under which this canal is to be constructed and operated. I will read that article:

The high contracting parties, desiring to preserve and maintain the "general principle" of neutralization established in Article VIII of the Clayton-Bulwer convention, which convention is hereby superseded, adopt, as the basis of such neutralization, the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention between Great Britain and certain other powers, signed at Constantinople October 22, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal; that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open, in time of war as in peace, to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise.

Mr. President, it will be noted that this first article preserves the general principle of neutralization, and that when this canal is constructed it shall be free and open in time of war as in time of peace to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise.

The following paragraphs provide:

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay, in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.

Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war or warlike materials in the canal except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of this article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within three marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than twenty-four hours at any one time except in case of distress, and in such case shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within twenty-four hours from the departure of a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations in sections Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this article shall apply to measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defense of the United States and the maintenance of public order.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all works necessary to the construction, maintenance and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof, for the purposes of this convention, and in time of war as in time of peace shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

7. No fortifications shall be erected commanding the canal or the waters adjacent. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

When we turn back to the general principle of neutralization as embodied in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty we find that this principle is to be maintained with the guaranty of the United States

and Great Britain and of such other nations as may, upon invitation, give their adhesion to this policy. The United States is therefore not to have the exclusive control of this canal when it is constructed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. RAWLINS. With pleasure.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does the Senator understand that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is now in force and that its provisions are binding?

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, the vital general principle of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, namely, the general principle of neutralization, is expressly continued in force by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, otherwise the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is superseded by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. We must, therefore, try to ascertain the significance of the general principle of neutralization by a reference to the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and when we go back to ascertain what the general principle of neutralization is, we find it to be that upon the construction of the canal it is to be dedicated to the commerce of the world, to the ships of war as well as to the ships of commerce, upon precise terms of equality; and this principle is under the protecting care not of the United States alone, but of the parties to the treaty—the United States and Great Britain and such other nations as may give adhesion to the principle thus enunciated.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. But the point I had in mind was this: Does the Senator understand that after our treaty, which we have adopted, any other nation can now come in and give adhesion to the principle of neutralization?

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, I so understand, and that seems to be the understanding of the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] in charge of this bill relating to fortifications. I will briefly give my reasons for that opinion.

When this canal has been constructed, when it has been dedicated in accordance with the terms of the treaty stipulation with Great Britain, pursuant to which it is to be constructed and maintained to the commerce of all nations, the ships of war as well as the ships of peace, every nation at once has secured to it an interest, a concern in and about the canal and its management, just as every citizen of a community for whose benefit a highway has been dedicated acquires an interest in the maintenance of that highway in accordance with the terms of the dedication. The United States is thus deprived of the control of the canal immediately upon its completion. It has such interest in it as is provided in the stipulations of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty—namely, the right to regulate tolls, with the qualification that those tolls shall not be unreasonable, and with the further qualification that those tolls must be uniform; but otherwise it has no right or interest in this canal, except such as pertain to every nation on the globe to whose commerce the canal is to be dedicated.

We are precluded from fortifying the canal: we are forbidden to take any effectual means for its defense; we are limited to such protection as may be afforded by the guaranty of the different nations interested in the preservation of the general principle of neutrality. What that amounts to, of course, will depend wholly upon the exigencies of the future, in case that one nation may become hostile to another nation and a condition of war may prevail.

Now, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate for one moment to the proposition of this guaranty of other nations, this right of invitation to the nations of Europe to intermeddle in the affairs of this continent and to interfere in regard to the control of a canal which is to be constructed with moneys taken from the people of the United States.

What will this guaranty amount to? For instance, the moment the canal is constructed and thrown open to commerce assume a condition of war existing between the United States and any other nation or any combination of nations, and the use and control of the canal will be of the utmost strategic importance, and any guaranty arising out of the provisions of any treaty between two nations, the moment a declaration of war is made between them, is abrogated and its obligation is no longer binding. There is at once an appeal to force and to arms. Every Senator must appreciate the fact that the moment such an exigency arises the United States, of course, for the sake of self-preservation, will desire to have absolute control of the canal and to shut out the belligerents; but she will be confronted with the obligation of the treaty stipulation into which she has entered with Great Britain, that this canal shall never be blockaded either in time of war or in time of peace; and the moment she does undertake to blockade it to the commerce of other nations than the one with which she happens to be engaged in war they have a right to point to our stipulation in that regard and say, "This canal must not be shut to our trade and commerce."

Then, instead of having war with one nation, we shall have

cause of war with many nations, and if they may for that cause actually engage in war and send their combined fleets, they may seize the canal, wrest it from the control of this country, and that means any advantage which the canal might be to us as a means of public defense will be taken away. Not only would it be taken away from us, but the nation having the most powerful fleet, or the combination of nations having the most powerful fleet, in case of war with us, we know will seize and will control that canal and that strip of land which now affords, in a way, protection to our commerce upon the Pacific Ocean and, to a degree, our commerce upon the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. Our enemies, having control of the canal, can send their ships of war either into the Pacific or into the Atlantic to assail our commerce. They are at once secured a highway and an easy means of access to attack the cities and commerce upon our Pacific coast as well as our insular possessions in the Pacific Ocean.

As pointed out by the military strategists, men who have devoted time and attention to this subject, and have written extensively upon it, our military and naval commanders, we are ignoring the advice which they have given in this respect. They have declared that a canal constructed in accordance with the principle of neutralization, as embodied in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and perpetuated in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, would not only not add any strength to our sources of defense, but would be a source of great military and naval weakness.

Mr. President, Congress in providing appropriations for the construction of this canal, in specifying the conditions upon which the appropriations for the construction of this canal are to take effect, seems to have been imbued with the importance of this matter, for in section 2 of that act it is provided:

SEC. 2. That the President is hereby authorized to acquire from the Republic of Colombia, for and on behalf of the United States, upon such terms as he may deem reasonable, perpetual control of a strip of land, the territory of the Republic of Colombia, not less than 6 miles in width, extending from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean, and the right to use and dispose of the waters thereon, and to excavate, construct, and to perpetually maintain, operate, and protect thereon a canal of such depth and capacity as will afford convenient passage of ships of the greatest tonnage and draft now in use, from the Caribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean, which control shall include the right to perpetually maintain and operate the Panama Railroad, if the ownership thereof, or a controlling interest therein, shall have been acquired by the United States, and also jurisdiction over said strip and the ports at the ends thereof to make such police and sanitary rules and regulations as shall be necessary to preserve order and preserve the public health thereon, and to establish such judicial tribunals as may be agreed upon thereon as may be necessary to enforce such rules and regulations.

The President may acquire such additional territory and rights from Colombia as in his judgment will facilitate the general purpose hereof.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the original treaty with Great Britain, known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and the provisions of those treaties which provide for the dedication of this canal to the use of all nations upon equal terms, Congress seems not to have been satisfied, and has provided in section 2 for the perpetual control by the United States of the territory through which this canal was to be constructed. It is scarcely necessary for me to allude to the fact that in the stress to begin this work and to obtain the money which is provided for in the act of Congress to which I have made reference it is now sought to dispense with the very conditions upon which the appropriation has been made. We are not to have governmental control of any strip of territory; the sovereignty of the existing Government is in no wise to be affected.

I speak now of matters which are public, to which I feel justified in calling attention, not desiring to refer to any matter that might more properly be considered in executive session.

The stipulations which I have read, contained in section 2 of the act of Congress "to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," were designed by Congress to be conditions precedent to the taking effect of the appropriation which is provided for in section 3 of this act. Section 3 says:

SEC. 3. That when the President shall have arranged to secure a satisfactory title to the property of the New Panama Canal Company, as provided in section 1 hereof, and shall have obtained by treaty control of the necessary Territory from the Republic of Colombia, as provided in section 2 hereof, he is authorized to pay for the property of the New Panama Canal Company \$40,000,000 and to the Republic of Colombia such sum as shall have been agreed upon, and a sum sufficient for both said purposes is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be paid on warrant or warrants drawn by the President.

It will thus be seen that Congress has made that appropriation dependent expressly upon the fulfillment of the conditions precedent which are specified in section 2 of the act. I am not going to discuss the question as to whether the Senate, in being called upon to ratify the treaty submitted by the Executive, ought to consent to any substantial departure from the conditions which Congress saw fit to specify and make precedent to the taking effect of this appropriation. Of course the rule is that when a treaty has once been approved and ratified in the constitutional way if it requires legislation to carry it into effect it is generally considered that there is an obligation of honor on the part of Congress to enact the necessary legislation to give effect to the

treaty; but I submit, Mr. President, that in a case of such great public importance as this, involving not merely the commercial welfare of the people of the United States, but materially affecting their means of public defense, when Congress, after deliberation and long consideration, has provided a condition, namely, governmental perpetual control of the territory through which the canal is constructed, Congress ought to have the privilege, first, before it is placed under any obligation to enact the legislation to carry that treaty into effect, to determine whether or not it will make a departure or modification of such condition.

Mr. President, it has been said—and it seems to me the contention can not be controverted—that the money provided in this act, dependent as it is upon the condition to which I have alluded, can not be drawn from the Treasury until the condition has been complied with. Senators say “substantially performed,” but I submit that no money can be drawn from the Treasury under the Constitution except by a specific appropriation to that end; and, if I am not mistaken as to the practice, the condition must not only be substantially but must be literally, must be precisely, complied with. Anyone who has had any experience with the Comptroller of the Treasury knows how strictly that Department has been in the habit of scrutinizing the right to draw money from the Treasury and exacting that there be a literal compliance with the terms upon which the appropriation has been made by Congress.

It is not going to serve any purpose to expedite action upon any treaty if that treaty can not be carried into effect without legislation of Congress, and I submit that it is appropriate, under the circumstances now surrounding us, that the consideration of Congress should be invited to this matter in advance of any action on the part of the executive department, with the concurrence of the Senate; in other words, it seems to me that Congress should be free to act upon this matter of reappropriating this money entirely untrammelled by any obligation arising from treaty stipulations between this Government and some other Government.

Mr. President, if I have made myself clear, if the present pending treaty is ratified and Congress shall have reappropriated this money to carry it into effect, the people of the United States will find in the end that they are in a predicament when they shall have completed this canal, at what cost can now only be a matter of conjecture. It is only partly constructed, at a cost of something more than \$275,000,000; this act appropriates \$40,000,000, and if the ratio of cost for the completion of the canal shall continue as the cost has in the past—and we have no reason to suppose it will be otherwise—it is safe to say that the people of the United States will not see the completion of this canal before there has been an expenditure of perhaps \$400,000,000. This money is taken from the Treasury of the United States, and the canal is dedicated to the use of the commerce of all the world. The territory through which the canal is constructed is not within any governmental control of the United States. The treaty expressly provides that the sovereignty over this strip of territory shall in no wise be affected by the provisions of the treaty and the construction of the canal in accordance with the terms of the treaty which is now pending.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. RAWLINS. With pleasure.
Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that it seems to me improper to refer to a treaty now under consideration and either directly or by indirection state what that treaty provides. I do not know that I caught exactly what the Senator said, but I understood him to refer to some treaty which was under consideration and to suggest that that treaty did not conform to the provisions of the act of Congress which he has recited. If I correctly understood him, I think he will agree with me that that ought not to be done.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to allude to anything that would infringe the rule of the Senate. The treaty itself has been made public. The Senator misapprehended what I said. I had discussed the act of Congress and its requirements and the conditions upon which it had made the appropriation of money for the construction of this canal dependent. That is a legitimate subject of consideration in open legislative session.

The only allusion which I made to the pending treaty was that if the canal is constructed in the end the people of the United States will find themselves in the predicament of having expended probably \$400,000,000 for the construction of a canal dedicated on equal terms to the use of the commerce of all nations, ships of war as well as other vessels, and that the sovereignty of the United States of Colombia over the territory through which the canal is constructed will be unaffected by the stipulations of the treaty under which the canal is constructed. That does not involve any disclosures which are not already public. I am not discussing anything which every Senator and every citizen in the

United States may not know by the record which the Senate has made public.

I may further state that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, of which full publicity has been given, and which has been ratified and is now a law of the United States, has, in so far as it prescribes any rules of conduct and is a compact between nations, precludes positively any fortification of this territory on the part of the United States. Not only is the sovereignty of the United States of Colombia unaffected by the treaty under consideration, but the perpetual independence and the continuance of that sovereignty in all its plenitude and force over our property are guaranteed by the United States, and the sovereignty over the islands which might in a way guard the entrance to the canal at its two ends is absolutely secured by the guaranty of the United States, coupled with its continued independence under similar guaranty forever, and the sovereignty over this property, constructed at the cost of \$400,000,000, is in another nation and not in the United States.

While Congress contemplated perpetual governmental control, it is now proposed to surrender every vestige of governmental control and leave the United States in the attitude of a private corporation, expending the money wrested under public law from the people of the United States, not for the benefit of the United States in time of war as a means of public defense, but to be dedicated to all the nations of the earth, with the recognition of the right of interference by European nations in the affairs of this continent and with the property which our money has created, as expressly stipulated in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. So we have a property which is not our property. The Government of the United States takes money from its Treasury and dedicates it, through a private corporation—

Mr. MASON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RAWLINS. Certainly.
Mr. MASON. I desire to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which never became a law as between the two Governments, provided that no fortifications should be erected, and in the second treaty that section was entirely stricken out. Under all law of construction, it is the same as if direct power had been given to the Government of the United States to fortify the canal, which is the reason that many of us voted for the second Hay-Pauncefote treaty. So now it is clearly within the power of the Government of the United States to fortify the canal. Is there any doubt of that in the mind of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. RAWLINS. I have not any doubt that the proposition of the Senator from Illinois has no foundation upon which to rest. In the first place, the Government of the United States has no governmental control over the territory through which the canal is to be constructed. It is under the sovereignty of another independent nation. Its control of that territory is absolutely recognized and guaranteed. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which was ratified by the Senate and became a law, expressly defined the conditions under which the canal should be constructed, and, as I have already pointed out, recognized and continued the general principle of neutrality which was designed to secure the protection of the canal by treaty obligation on the part of the United States and Great Britain and such other nations as might yield their adhesion to that stipulation.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—
Mr. RAWLINS. That the treaty which we made—
Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—
Mr. RAWLINS. Will the Senator permit me for a moment?
Mr. ALDRICH. I do not want to cut off the final address of the Senator.

Mr. RAWLINS. I yield to the Senator.
Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator has been discussing a matter which should be discussed in executive session. It seems to me there can be no question about that. I do not want to seem to be at all rigid about this matter, and as the Senator will have no opportunity to discuss it, except for a few days, I do not intend to be too restrictive about it. But I think the Senator himself must see that this treaty ought not to be discussed in open session. I do not know what the Senator's intentions are or how long he expects to go on with this discussion, but it seems to me that certainly this speech ought not to be made in open session.

Mr. RAWLINS. I was not alluding to the pending treaty. I was referring to the treaty which has been ratified by the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the Senator has constantly been alluding to the pending treaty and discussing its provisions and the effect which those provisions will have upon other legislation. I think the Senator knows as well as I do and as the other members of the Senate do that that is a discussion of the Panama treaty, and I would suggest that that discussion be restricted within very narrow limits, or that it ought to be made in executive session.

Mr. RAWLINS. It has not been my purpose to allude to anything which might be regarded as confidential. Of course, we know the reason for discussing in executive session treaties with other governments. We do not want to say things which might be offensive to other governments. But here we have an act of Congress; we have two treaties which have long been ratified, which are matters within public knowledge, and which are of the utmost public importance to the people of the United States. Congress has legislated as to the conditions upon which it is willing to make appropriations of money to construct the canal. The treaty which is now pending has been made public. Any consideration which arises purely from the construction of the language that that treaty employs is as much entitled to publicity as the treaty itself.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his question of order.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Utah, as I understand, is discussing a treaty which is in the consideration of the Senate in executive session, and, as I understand, he claims that he has the right to discuss it because the text of the treaty has been made public. I respectfully suggest to the Chair the point of order that that is not true.

Nominations for office are always made public, but it never has been held that the merits of such nominations, because the nominations had been made public, could be discussed publicly.

Mr. RAWLINS. I should like—

Mr. HOAR. It puts in an awkward position the Senators who might have something to say in reply to the Senator. They can not reply publicly. What they may have to say may be based on something that clearly is confidential.

Mr. RAWLINS. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question? It is not my purpose to infringe on any rule of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I am sure of that.

Mr. RAWLINS. I recognize the long experience of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senate orders a pending treaty to be made public. That gives publicity, of course, to all the terms of that treaty. I ask the Senator if he would regard any Senator who might rise here and read the treaty as being guilty of any infringement of the rules?

Mr. HOAR. No; I should not.

Mr. RAWLINS. Now, Mr. President, that being so, if a Senator should invite attention, after reading any clause of the treaty, to the necessary significance or meaning of the language thus employed, would he any more infringe the rule of the Senate?

Mr. HOAR. I think he would, Mr. President. I think then he would be debating the merits of something which the rules of the Senate require to be debated, if at all, in confidence.

Suppose a man be nominated for Chief Justice of the United States. The nomination is given to the public. Is it open to a Senator to come here and discuss the public record of that gentleman with reference to his fitness to be confirmed? Nobody can answer him without being restricted to public matters.

Mr. RAWLINS. I think the analogy which the Senator undertakes to make is not quite apropos, but it is not necessary to dwell upon this subject, because I have no further allusion to make to the pending treaty.

Mr. President, just a few other considerations.

Mr. HOAR. May I put a question to the Senator?

Mr. RAWLINS. With pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. Do I understand that the Senator avows his purpose to discuss the merits of the pending treaty so far as to call attention to his views and opinions in regard to the meaning and effect of certain passages in it, the treaty having been made public?

Mr. RAWLINS. Not further than I have already done. I have said all I intend to say on that subject.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator to be stating his doctrine about it. I want to know if I correctly understood the Senator to claim the right to discuss in open session the pending treaty, which has been made public, so far as to call attention to the effect and meaning of particular passages in it?

Mr. RAWLINS. I have already done that to the extent I desire to do it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order raised by the Senator from Massachusetts. Discussion of a treaty is not in order in legislative session unless in executive session the injunction of secrecy has been removed.

Mr. RAWLINS. Do I understand the ruling of the President to be that I may not discuss the act of Congress and treaties already ratified by the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair simply decided that the discussion of a treaty which is now under consideration in executive session is out of order in legislative session.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, we will have no controversy about that, because I have said all I designed to say upon the subject. All that I care to say in addition to what I have already said is this: I voted against the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. I have opposed the policy of the majority in relation to the conditions upon which this canal is to be constructed. I think the United States is going to expend a large sum of money, and that under the treaties which have been ratified by the Senate we are surrendering every means of affording protection to the property which is thus to be created.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RAWLINS. That when the canal is constructed under the terms of the treaties already ratified—

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President—

Mr. RAWLINS. I should like to finish. I am nearly through. If the Senator will be patient just a moment I am sure I am not going to infringe any of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. I have not listened attentively to the speech of the Senator from Utah, I am sorry to say, and therefore I am not aware fully of what he has been saying. But I arose for the purpose of saying, and of making a motion if necessary, that if he intended to discuss this treaty in any way I would move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business with closed doors.

Mr. RAWLINS. I might as well say that there are additional things to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, and I have not any objection to discussing it in secret session.

Mr. CULLOM (to Mr. RAWLINS). Do you want to do it now?

Mr. PERKINS. I will state to my friend the Senator from Utah that unless he has some particular amendment to propose to this bill I hope he will permit us to dispose of it at this time, as it must go into conference, and the hour when this Congress will close is very near. It seems to me we ought to dispose of the bill at this time.

Mr. RAWLINS. Let the Senators upon the other side determine their own course about this matter. There are a few things which I desire to say, not with a view of detaining the Senate. I have not quite completed what I have to say, and it is open to them to pursue such a course as they deem proper. I want to conform entirely to the rules and traditions of the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator intends to go on, I will move that the doors of the Senate be closed.

Mr. RAWLINS. I have already said practically all that I want to say on that subject.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator is through, I will not make the motion.

Mr. CARMACK. I did not understand the Senator from Utah to say he was through.

Mr. CULLOM. He said he was substantially through.

Mr. RAWLINS. If I may be permitted to repeat, in order to make a continuous statement of what I was desiring to say, this canal, under the operation of the treaties already ratified by the Senate, against which I cast my vote, and the policy proposed by the majority, as I understand it, involves and will involve the expenditure by the people of the United States of something like \$400,000,000 and the surrender, at the same time, of the right to fortify, protect, and defend the property, leaving it to the care of an independent Government and with an invitation—

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Utah is out of order in discussing in legislative session a pending treaty or its provisions.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate proceed to secret legislative session.

Mr. LODGE. I second the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The galleries will be cleared and the doors will be closed.

The doors were thereupon closed, and at the expiration of forty-five minutes were reopened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The fortifications appropriation bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] for a moment. I was not in the Chamber in the early part of the remarks made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS], and so did not hear all the questions which he propounded to the Senator from California. I understood the Senator from California to say, however, that there was no provision in the pending bill in respect to providing for any fortifications in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator's understanding is correct. There are no provisions in the bill for the fortification of any of our insular possessions whatever. An amendment was proposed to the committee for that purpose, but they declined to put it in the bill.

Mr. CARMACK. I was about to ask the Senator if he himself

or if the committee have given any consideration to the question of fortifying the various islands in the Philippine Archipelago for the purpose of making them secure against possible attack and invasion in case of a foreign war?

Mr. PERKINS. No such proposition was presented to your committee, Mr. President, for their consideration, and therefore any opinion which I might express would have no value whatever.

Mr. CARMACK. I would suggest to the Senator and to the Senate that it has been said here by distinguished Senators, amongst others by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], at this session of Congress that our control over the Philippine Islands would increase the dangers of complications with foreign nations and the danger of foreign wars. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], at a previous session of Congress, in discussing this question said, I believe, that in case of a foreign war our Philippine possessions would be the first ones attacked, and therefore that there would be very great necessity of strongly fortifying those possessions and increasing our Navy for the purpose of protecting and defending them. It does seem to me that Senators upon the other side of the Chamber who have a fixed purpose of holding, maintaining, and retaining possession of those islands ought to consider the question of fortifying them for the purpose of protecting them against a foreign enemy, and they ought to be prepared to make some statement to the Senate with respect to it.

I will ask the Senator from California, or any member of the committee, if the amendment to which he has referred was offered by a member of the committee?

Mr. PERKINS. It was presented by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers as a part of the estimates of appropriation of a million and a half dollars to be used in fitting up emplacements for fortifications. As I stated, however, it was not taken up or entertained by the committee. No reference, therefore, is made in the bill to appropriations for fortifications for our insular possessions.

Mr. CARMACK. The amendment was recommended, as I understand the Senator to say, by the Secretary of War.

Mr. PERKINS. The recommendation was that \$500,000 might be used, in the discretion of the War Department, for fortifications in our insular possessions.

Mr. CARMACK. Then I should like to ask the Senator if while the matter was under consideration the committee made any estimate of the cost of properly fortifying those various islands?

Mr. PERKINS. None whatever, Mr. President.

Mr. CARMACK. Would the Senator mind saying what his own opinion is as to the necessity of fortifying those islands?

Mr. PERKINS. Not being an expert in that line, I should prefer, first, that my friend from Tennessee should give his opinion and make his estimate. It is much easier to criticize and tear down than it is to build up. When the proper time arrives I doubt not the capacity of my friend from Tennessee, if it be deemed expedient and advisable, to assist us in devising such a plan as will protect the possessions of this country; but the time never has been, and I believe it never will come, when we are not able to protect and defend our own country and our own possessions. We have a Navy to-day equal almost in its efficiency to any in the world, and I believe that we are able to compete with and meet in conflict any navy to-day that belongs to any foreign country.

Mr. CARMACK. Of course I agree to all that. We are able to defend our possessions; but the Senator, I think, will agree with me that we are not able to defend our possessions, or even our own country, without preparing necessary defenses and fortifications and a navy for that purpose. I was not asking the Senator for any detailed statement as to what it would cost. I was simply asking his opinion as to whether or not it would be necessary to fortify the Philippine Islands for the purpose of their protection, and if the Senator has any opinion upon that question I should like to hear from him in respect to it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I think our coast defenses and the vessels that we have are quite sufficient for any defense that we may be required to make.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

SAFETY APPLIANCES ON RAILROADS.

Mr. FORAKER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3500) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1893,

and amended April 1, 1896, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "Columbia," insert the words "and shall apply in all cases, whether or not the couplers brought together are of the same kind, make, or pattern."

On page 2, line 8, after the word "to," insert the words "train brakes."

On page 2, line 4, after the word "all," insert the word "trains."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out of amendment numbered 2 the words: "Provided, That the Interstate Commerce Commission may, upon application and after full hearing, decrease said minimum percentage as to any common carrier for a stated limited time; and provided that in no case shall such reduction permit the running of any train with less power or train brakes than are required by section 1 of the act of March 2, 1893;" and the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 3, 4, and 5, and agree to the same.

J. B. FORAKER,

J. H. MILLARD,

MURPHY J. FOSTER,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

IRVING P. WANGER,

J. S. SHERMAN,

W. C. ADAMSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish the Senator from Ohio would explain, in a few words, what is the effect of this conference report?

Mr. FORAKER. It was provided in the bill as it passed the Senate that 65 per cent of the cars in any train, if that many were to be found in it equipped with air brakes, were to be coupled together. The House of Representatives reduced that to 50 per cent, and then added an amendment to the effect that any road might apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission and, on showing good cause therefor, secure a reduction to a still less percentage. The House receded from that part of their amendment authorizing this application to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does it now stand at 50 or 65 per cent?

Mr. FORAKER. It stands at 50 per cent now. I think it is satisfactory to everybody concerned. That was the principal amendment. The other amendments were merely to correct the text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SAFE-KEEPING OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 7301) to further provide for the safe-keeping of public money, and for other purposes.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry on that motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to ask, If that motion prevails will it set aside what is known as the omnibus statehood bill—the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly; but I shall move to resume the consideration of the unfinished business after the conclusion of the bill which I have just named.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] does not seem to be in his seat at this moment, and I do not think we ought, in his absence, to displace the bill of which he has charge.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Pennsylvania understood that I was going to make this motion. I ask that the question be put on the motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 7301) to further provide for the safe-keeping of public money, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. DUBOIS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLLIVER (when his name was called). The roll call taken yesterday indicates that I voted, notwithstanding my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. I have taken the liberty to transfer that pair for the remainder of the session to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], and I desire to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN], but understanding that he would vote on this question the same way I do, I shall take the liberty of voting. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. I do not know how he would vote on this question, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. KEARNS. I am paired with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. GIBSON], and therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi (after having voted in the negative). I desire to inquire if the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Then, having a general pair with that Senator, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. McCUMBER (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to ask if the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will withdraw my vote, as I have a pair with that Senator.

Mr. ALLISON (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire whether the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. ALLISON. Then I withdraw my vote, being paired with that Senator.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—42.

Aldrich,	Dolliver,	Hoar,	Platt, Conn.
Bacon,	Dryden,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, N. Y.
Bard,	Elkins,	Kean,	Pritchard,
Beveridge,	Fairbanks,	Kittredge,	Quarles,
Burnham,	Foraker,	Lodge,	Simon,
Burrows,	Frye,	McComas,	Spooner,
Cullom,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Stewart,
Deboe,	Gamble,	Millard,	Tillman,
Depew,	Hale,	Mitchell,	Wetmore.
Dietrich,	Hanna,	Nelson,	
Dillingham,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	

NAYS—18.

Bailey,	Culberson,	Morgan,	Teller,
Berry,	Dubois,	Patterson,	Turner,
Blackburn,	Heitfeld,	Pettus,	Vest.
Carmack,	McEnery,	Quay,	
Clay,	Mallory,	Rawlins,	

NOT VOTING—28.

Alger,	Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Penrose,
Allison,	Daniel,	Kearns,	Proctor,
Bate,	Foster, La.	McCumber,	Scott,
Burton,	Foster, Wash.	McLaurin, Miss.	Simmons,
Clapp,	Gibson,	McLaurin, S. C.	Taliaferro,
Clark, Mont.	Harris,	Mason,	Warren,
Clark, Wyo.	Hawley,	Money,	Wellington.

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 7301) to further provide for the safe-keeping of public money, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. In deference to the expressions on both sides of the Chamber, I move to amend, on page 2, line 19, by striking out "fifty" and inserting "ten," so that cities and counties of 10,000 inhabitants or more will be included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 19, it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "fifty" and inserting "ten;" so as to read:

And which has at such date more than 10,000 inhabitants as established by the last national census.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Will the Secretary read that part of the bill which relates to the receiving of railroad bonds as it was amended the other day?

The Secretary read as follows:

On the first mortgage bonds of any railroad company, not including street railway bonds, which has paid dividends of not less than 4 per cent per annum regularly and continuously on its entire capital stock for a period of not less than ten years previous to the deposit of the bonds.

Mr. HALE. It has been suggested to me by a very eminent lawyer, who has sent me a letter, that after the words "ten years" the word "next" be inserted; so that it will read "ten years next previous to the deposit of the bonds."

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no objection to that.

Mr. HALE. There is no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, the objections I have to this bill, or most of them, will apply with equal force to the law as it now exists; and no amendment that the Senator from Rhode Island

may offer or change that he may propose in regard to particular features of the bill with reference to the character of the bonds or the amount of the security would change my view of it, because my objections to it are fundamental.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] the other day stated that the law as it stands upon the statute book to-day authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit in such national banks as he may designate the public revenues, except the revenues that are received from customs duties. This bill proposes to enlarge that act and to authorize him to deposit the money received from all sources, including customs duties, in such national banks as he may designate.

I am not familiar with the causes which induced Congress to make the exception with respect to customs dues that was made when the act was passed in 1864. I have not examined the debates, but I imagine the object and purpose of the act originally were the convenience of the Government; that the internal-revenue taxes and the receipts from public lands and from various other sources were often received at remote points, distant from the Treasury or a subtreasury, and that in order to provide for the better safety of the money and the security of the officer it was provided that the revenue of the Government, other than receipts from customs, might be deposited in national banks, as it would be far more convenient and afford much greater safety. The facilities of transmission were not so great then as they are at present.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BERRY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I think I can state the reason. At that time the customs dues were paid in gold, and the Government had to pay the interest on the bonds in gold, and I think that is the reason why the distinction was made.

Mr. BERRY. Perhaps it may be as the Senator states—that the customs dues were paid in gold and all other receipts were receivable in United States Treasury notes.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. BERRY. But whatever the purpose or reason was—perhaps there was more than one—the Congress did make this distinction and provided for the deposit, as I have stated.

My objection to the present bill is that it extends the operation of what I regard as a most objectionable law. It extends and enlarges the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to do that which I think he never should have been authorized to do in any case. I object to it because it authorizes him to select a particular class of our citizens, a class engaged in a particular pursuit, and himself to loan to that particular class—because this bill provides for nothing else than a demand loan—the Government money at a rate of interest less than is customary to be charged by the banks of the country. It confines it to that particular class. The Secretary of the Treasury can loan it to no other class. He can not name any citizens to receive this money save and except he be a national banker.

Not only that, but it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to select from that class a particular national banker with whom he will deposit this money, if you choose to call it a deposit, or to whom he will loan the money of the United States, at a rate of interest of 1½ per cent per year. He can not extend this privilege to any State bank. It might be that the State bank is more solvent and is in rivalry with the national bank, and the State bank might be able to and would offer securities, United States bonds, if you wish, or any other class of securities named in the proposed act, and yet he could not designate that bank. He must select this class, the privileged class, to whom this money can be loaned, and he selects from that class.

Mr. President, the workings of this law in the past, as it stands on the statute books to-day—and this, as I said before, only enlarges and extends the power which is now conferred by law—in many instances has been such as to bring scandal upon the country. It has been charged again and again that the Secretary of the Treasury selected his favorite banks, his particular friends, and deposited the public money in their banks, thereby giving them advantages that other bankers could not have.

It has been charged again and again that it was used for political purposes. I say it is true. Prior to the time, in 1885, when the Democrats came into power, throughout the section of country in which I live the national banks which were known to be in sympathy with the Republican party, as a matter of course, were universally named for the deposit of United States funds. I admit that when the Democrats came in they sought also to have the Democratic banks named as depositories. I think I wrote myself a letter stating that one bank in Little Rock had had the deposit for years, and I thought it should be extended to the other bank there, which was equally solvent and equally entitled to it. And I think I said it was a Democratic bank. But I repeat that it has

been used for political purposes and it will be used for favoritism. No man can deny it.

I remember a case which happened two or three years ago, and it was fully discussed in the House of Representatives. If I remember the proof in that case and that which was admitted, and I state it from memory only, because I have not read it recently, a certain bank in the city of New York purchased from the Government of the United States a public building. I do not remember the cost of it, but I think it was some three or four or five hundred thousand dollars. The purchase price was agreed on, and the bank pretended to pay the purchase money, except a small balance. I do not remember the amount. They did not pay it all, because if the deed had been made to the bank the proof in the case showed that the bank would have had to pay taxes on the property. Therefore it was not made. But then that purchase price, instead of being deposited and paid by order of the Secretary of the Treasury into the Treasury, was left in the bank without interest, without charge.

The Government then turned around and rented this public building from the bank, paying a rental the amount of which I do not know how much, and occupied the building. The bank kept the money in their vaults and loaned it to citizens at whatever rate of interest they could get, and they paid, as it was stated, no taxes upon the property. I say that is one of the evils which have come from this law, because it is a law enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to pick out his favorite or his political and personal friend, and give him an advantage which others can not secure.

I do not pretend, Mr. President, that this particular Secretary or that would exercise the discretion in that way, but I say it is human nature that he should do so, and in this Government no such power should ever be conferred upon one man.

I admit, and I do not want the Senator from Rhode Island to come back and confront me and say, that is the present law. It is the present law, save and except that this bill is applied to customs dues and proposes to enlarge and extend it to that extent.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BERRY. I do.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It is something more than the present law in that on the deposits of the Government in such banks now no interest is paid.

Mr. BERRY. Yes.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. And under the proposed law the banks will have to pay interest.

Mr. BERRY. I will come to that later. It is different from the present law in that respect. Heretofore the excuse has been that it was simply a deposit, and it was better to deposit the money in the banks than to have it tied up in the Treasury.

Now, the Senator from Connecticut comes in and says this is a change in the fact that the bill provides that the banks shall pay 1½ per cent interest. It is changed in that particular. But I want to put to the Senator from Connecticut the question whether in a free government, where all men are supposed to be equal and to have equal rights before the law, it is just and fair to say that the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to whom he will loan—and I repeat it is nothing but a demand loan—the Government money; to what class of citizens and to what particular citizen of that particular class he will loan it, when another class, equally responsible, equally deserving, is denied that privilege?

There may be two rival banks in any city in this country, one holding a State charter and another holding a charter from the General Government. You take the people's money and turn it over to one of those banks at 1½ per cent interest, and thereby enable the national bank to crush out its less fortunate rival, although it may be able and willing to tender the same class of securities that the national bank does. This, Mr. President, is one of the main objections I have not only to the present law, but to the proposed enlargement.

It was but a few years ago when there was a class of citizens throughout the South and West who believed that they should be granted special privileges. They made the demand upon the Government that they should be loaned money at a low rate of interest and that they should deposit farm products as security for it. The scheme was wild and impracticable. I opposed it because it was class legislation. I say to-day that it was not any more class legislation than this bill is. I admit that the bill was impracticable in execution, but in selecting a particular class and saying that that class only should have the benefit of the people's money, the one scheme was no more objectionable than the present one. This gives it to national banks, and it enables the Secretary of the Treasury to continue the power he now has to designate which particular one of the national banks shall have it.

But, Mr. President, this is not the only objection to the bill. I take it that any man who has watched the operations of these

banks in the past, that any man who is familiar with the tremendous power they exercise in this Government to-day, knows full well that when this money is once loaned to them it is not intended that it shall ever be repaid. I assert here upon the floor of the Senate that if misfortune should come, if the revenues should fall off, and if a general demand was made by the Secretary of the Treasury upon national banks to return this money to the Treasury, there would go up a cry from one end of the land to the other that such an order would destroy business; that it would crush out every enterprise; that such an order was suicidal; that there would be no money to circulate among the people; and then would come the same old statement that it was far better to issue more bonds and sell them rather than to force the banks to turn this money back into the Treasury of the United States.

But, Mr. President, another and the most serious objection of all to this bill, as I think, and one which it seems to me can not be answered, is this: When the very law as it stands is enlarged as the Senator from Rhode Island desires to enlarge it, so as to include all receipts of the Government, and when a particular class of individuals can borrow the Government's money at 1½ per cent and loan it out at 5 or 8, as the case may be—4, 5, or 8, and in some parts of the country 10 per cent—when that can be done you array every national bank in this land and every friend of every national bank throughout the country against any reduction of taxation whatever which would tend to deprive them of this privilege.

Mr. President, I say it is an everlasting shame and disgrace to this country that we should collect year by year millions of dollars in the way of taxes from the people and then turn around and vote to loan it out, if you will, to a few favorite bankers, at 1½ per cent, for them to loan it to other people at whatever interest they can secure. And you not only do that, but you put into their hands a power and a force that will prevent the repeal of oppressive tax laws, and the very money that has been wrung from the people by unjust taxation will be used to prevent any reduction of that taxation.

Why can we not reduce the taxes? The Senator from Rhode Island, more, I think, than any other man in this country, has been the champion of high protective duties. He stands to-day as one of those who say that the law shall not be changed. He is at the head of those who say they will stand pat on the high taxes, which he now says bring into the Government Treasury millions of dollars more than what is sufficient to pay the expenses. Now he comes around and says, "Oh, if you tie it up, you will thereby decrease the money in circulation and affect the business of the country." If the Senator from Rhode Island would repeal the infamous tax laws and collect only such money as is required to pay the expenses of this Government, then there would be no necessity for a law authorizing the loan of Government money to these individuals. I say that is an objection which no man can answer.

But Senators say it is far better to turn it over to these banks rather than to tie it up in the Treasury. Mr. President, rather than to give these banks the privilege which this bill confers, it would be far better to take the surplus that now exists and buy in bonds and reduce the debt of the United States. I know the bonds are at a premium, but that would be much better in a Government like ours—a Government which claims that all men have an equal chance—than to wring taxes from the whole people and then say we will loan the money out to a particular class at 1½ per cent interest and enable them to loan it out at a much larger interest, an injustice which, if ever practiced generally in the affairs of this Government, would necessarily undermine the very foundation upon which it rests.

No wonder that the banks in New York have grown immensely rich. No wonder, Mr. President, that Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, the banker of New York, to-day, by reason largely of the transactions he has had with the different Secretaries of the Treasury, has gained such an immense fortune and such a control over the business organizations that he has more power to-day than even the President himself. Only last fall, when the whole country was crying out for fuel, when we were confronted with a coal famine, when the President of the United States called together the owners of the coal mines in Pennsylvania and the representatives of labor organizations and appealed to them on high and patriotic grounds to enter into arbitration to avert the danger which threatened the whole country, the owners of the coal mines, I will not say contemptuously refused, but they did refuse to accede to the proposition of the President.

All over the country there was great anxiety as to the result. The telegraph wires flashed the news that the representatives of labor had expressed a willingness to agree to arbitration if the President would name the arbitrators. But the owners of the coal fields, the papers said, refused. A few days after Mr. Pierpont Morgan was induced or persuaded to come to this city, and when he made the request that the arbitration should go on,

the coal barons immediately acceded to his proposition and the arbitration ensued. That is the history of it as given, which I have never seen denied.

The immense power wielded by this banker of New York, by this man who has again and again bought Government securities at a low price, and on one noted occasion, I think, by private contract, and sold them at an immense increase on the markets of New York, is by reason of these unjust laws, by reason of this favoritism, by reason of the immunities enjoyed by the national banks.

The great objection to the banks to-day, and has ever been, is on account of their power to expand or contract the currency. They practice it again and again—to force up bonds or force them down, to reduce the amount of money in circulation or to increase it. They have gone on from year to year until to-day they are the most powerful organizations throughout this country. It is largely due to them that these immense fortunes have been built up into a few hands and industries have been organized into trusts which are so strong to-day that the Congress of the United States dare not grapple with them.

I know it will be said that this Congress has passed a measure known as the Nelson amendment. What does it do, Mr. President? What is there in the amendment? The sole thing in it is that the Department of Commerce may inquire into the business of these corporations and associations and report the matter to the President of the United States, and if he see proper he may make it public. That is all.

That is the trust law you passed; and now, when we are about to adjourn, your papers and organs throughout the country say we have passed a trust law which will curb the combines and destroy these monstrous trusts. Yet there is upon our Calendar to-day a proposed trust law, prepared by a Republican House and passed by that Republican House almost unanimously, sent here to a Republican Judiciary Committee, reported back by a Republican Senator, and placed upon the Calendar; and yesterday, when we proposed to consider it, there were but two Republicans on the other side of the Chamber who cast their votes for it. Yet you tell us you have passed trust laws, and now, having done that, you propose to enlarge the powers of the national banks.

Mr. President, I am opposed to it. No appeal about the scarcity of money can affect the foundation principle upon which it is based. I remember to have read when I was a boy how President Jackson was engaged in a great fight with the old National Bank and the appeal made on the floor of the Senate of the United States by Mr. Clay and others, far more eloquent than any which has been made or can be made here to-day. That appeal was that if the President removed the deposits from the old National Bank it would so reduce the amount of money in circulation that it would bring sorrow and distress throughout the land. It was painted in the most glowing colors. But the old hero who sat in the Presidential chair unheeded those passionate appeals. He said: "This National Bank has become a menace to the liberties of the people, and, by the Eternal, I will destroy it, whatever the consequences may be."

He did destroy it. He earned the gratitude and the love of the entire people of the country, and to-day his name is more honored and revered for that act than for any other that occurred within his history. He believed in the rights of the people. He believed that in a government like ours, where all should be equal under the law, special privileges conferred by law upon a special class, and leaving the Secretary of the Treasury to select from that class, were dangerous to the Republic.

Mr. President, the power of the old National Bank as compared with the power of the national banks to-day was but of small consequence. The power of the national banks to-day is ten times greater than the power exercised by that one bank which General Jackson said threatened the liberties of the people of America.

To-day, Mr. President, these national banks control elections; they dictate appointments; and, what is far worse, they dictate the passage of laws through the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Rhode Island said to me this morning, I think it was, that he had letters from some national banks who were opposed to this law. Mr. President, another Senator on this floor told me a day or two ago that when the bill was first printed he received a telegram from a strong bank in his city urging him to oppose it, but within a day or two thereafter he received a letter from the same president of the same bank telling him that he had changed his mind and that he hoped the Senator from Virginia would favor the law.

When the Senator from Rhode Island tells me that the national banks are opposed to this measure, and then when I see him surrounded by the men who are urging the passage of the bill and say that they are in favor of it and the national banks are against it, I say he states two propositions which can never be reconciled.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MASON. I want the Senator to understand that so far as the banks of Chicago are concerned, I have received this dispatch this morning and they are opposed to the measure. I represent the city of Chicago as a part of my State. They protest against the bill and I feel constrained to vote with the Senator against its passage. If the Senator will permit me I will state their reason.

Mr. BERRY. Not now; after I get through.

Mr. MASON. I simply wanted—

Mr. BERRY. I beg not to be interrupted further now.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has simply admitted what I had already charged, that the power of these national banks to control the votes of Senators and Members is most potent. It had its influence, it seems, on him, and perhaps on others.

I want to emphasize another thing. It may be that there are some banks in Chicago or Kansas City against it, but I repeat, the Senator from Rhode Island has been the friend of these banks from the time they were organized; he has been their champion; and when he, with others from the East whom I could name, but will not, tells me that the national banks of New York or those generally throughout the country are opposed to this bill, I tell him I can not but think that he is mistaken. I can not entertain such a belief. If they opposed it they would be here in these lobbies and in that Marble Room opposing it with all the power that they have.

But whether they are opposed to it or for it, Mr. President, it matters not with me. I take my stand upon the ground that this is an enlargement, an extension, of the power which is given to a Secretary of the Treasury which should never be conferred upon any mortal man in a free government. I take my stand against it because it selects a particular class of our citizens engaged in a particular pursuit, and gives to them privileges and rights that are not conferred upon others. I take my stand against it because it will enable the Republican party to still maintain the high and unjust taxes that are levied upon the people to-day. It is an injustice which no argument can justify to levy taxes upon the people over and above what is necessary to pay the expenses of the Government. And then you turn around and either give or loan it at 1½ per cent interest to particular individuals whose power and influence will thereby be increased.

I do not say how this Secretary would use it, but we all know that it is one of the most powerful engines in the hands of a political party that was ever given to any mortal man. We know that the power given him to say how much and to what particular individual this money shall be loaned will enable him to secure such a campaign fund for political purposes as has never been used in any campaign in the past. I can not conceive of a law more mischievous upon the statute book than this one which proposes to amend and enlarge its powers.

But it is said, Mr. President, that it ought to pass because it gives the chance to deposit securities as collateral for the loan of this money over and above and beyond that which is extended by the present law. That is true, Mr. President. The bill proposes to take State securities. It proposes to take municipal and county bonds of a certain character. The Senator has reduced it now to bonds of cities of 10,000 inhabitants instead of 50,000, as the bill was originally reported. But whether it be much or little, whether the purpose be to enhance the securities, State, municipal, or first railroad bonds, I know not and I care not, but I for one will never vote to enlarge and extend the power, which is already greater than ever ought to have been conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury.

I do not know; it may be that I am wrong, but if I have learned one thing more than another of the Democratic faith and the belief of the Democratic party, it has always been from the days of Jefferson and Jackson down to the present time that we stood for the equality of all people before the law, and that we stood in absolute and unalterable opposition to any law that conferred special privileges upon one class which would not be extended to all other classes.

We are unalterably opposed to legislation made for the benefit of particular individuals as contrary to that of the great masses of the people. That is the faith in which I have been raised. Whether the national banks are for it or against it; whether the Democratic party or any member of it supports it or opposes it, I, for one, so long as I have a seat upon this floor, will cast my vote and raise my voice against any legislation of this character which confers additional power on the national banks and special benefits upon particular individuals.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

Mr. BATE. I have been out of the Senate all the morning. I offer an amendment, if it is in order. I ask if the bill is now amendable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the amendment can be offered under the rule. Does the Senator desire to have it read at the present time?

Mr. BATE. Yes, sir. It is short. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add as a new section at the end of the bill the following:

Sec. —. That all the laws of the United States imposing any tax on bank notes issued by banks or corporations or associations chartered or authorized by any State in the Union be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for a moment, simply to offer an amendment?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator need not have it read now.

Mr. CLAY. It is to come in on page 3, at the end of section 1. I ask that it be read. It consists of only three or four lines.

Mr. STEWART. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, at the end of section 1, add:

That as far as practicable the Secretary of the Treasury shall fairly distribute the deposits herein authorized throughout the country.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have always been opposed to any financial legislation having in view hard times. I am opposed to hard times. I am opposed to contraction in any form which shall interfere with business.

It is impossible to regulate the revenues so as to have no surplus on hand. In fact that would be a very dangerous experiment. We would get into trouble when the revenues fall off, and we would have to borrow money in emergencies, as we have done on various occasions, paying an enormous interest. We had to sell 4 percents, that had been sold theretofore for 1 cent premium for every year they had to run, at 4½ per cent, when, in fact, the market price would put them at 30 per cent. We have seen those things happen on account of a deficiency in the revenues. We have seen such emergencies and we have seen panics. Any deficiency in the revenue or any idea that the Treasury would run dry would produce a panic and embarrass business. I do not believe we ought to have a condition of things which would produce that result.

This is a plain proposition. We have a surplus revenue. It is a necessity. In order to carry on the business we must have it. The only question is whether we shall withdraw it from circulation and make contraction and hard times, and an irregular contraction because the amount will vary at various times.

For a long time the Government has had the right to deposit surplus revenues in the banks. At first they did not deposit receipts from customs because those receipts were payable in gold and had to be reserved to pay interest on the bonds. That is the reason why the distinction was made at the time. That practice has gone on now for nearly forty years. The privilege has been exercised constantly. There ought to have been such legislation before this time. It should have been exercised in a way less injurious to the interests of the country. It should have been more general. More banks should have had the privilege and the security should have been enlarged so that more banks could take it and have a small interest paid.

No banks are opposed to this measure unless it be those that had the benefit of the former legislation and expect to have the deposits, on which they are not paying interest. They may be opposed to it, but I am inclined to think that the banks in general will be in favor of it. It will simply keep the money in circulation and stop contraction and hard times.

I hope there will be no vote in the Senate against the passage of this very just measure, which will give us more money, and more stable money, and give us better times. If the time should come when there would be contraction, if next year the business should fall off and hard times should come, if stocks should fall, if the price of property should fall, and if men should become embarrassed, they would not be pleased with the votes of those who kept money tied up in the Treasury which ought to be in circulation.

Now, it is proposed to put this money in circulation. I think this is a very good plan. It takes solvent banks. They put up a good security and they pay 1½ per cent interest on the deposit. That keeps the money in circulation and gives good times to the country and makes stability, and it does not interfere with any monetary principle. In fact this is about the only way we can keep the money in circulation, because there will be more money collected than is paid out on occasions, and sometimes largely more. But to stop then and repeal your revenue laws and produce a deficit would be very dangerous. If we repeal the revenue laws it must be done cautiously or we will produce a deficit. A deficit is a most disastrous thing. It makes countless millions mourn, because it brings bankruptcy and ruin to the homes of the people in general.

We have not forgotten the crisis even of 1893, where millions suffered and the losses that were incurred from the contraction and the deficiency in the currency. There is now no deficit. The country now is immensely prosperous. We have good times. The output of gold has given us a basis, the whole world is moving on, and it would be a shame now if on account of lack of business principles we should tie up the money in the Treasury and make the volume of money irregular and make times hard without any occasion for it at all.

Nobody can be injured by putting the money in solvent banks with good security at 1½ per cent. It certainly will be better than to have it tied up in the Treasury; and we must have a surplus or be in danger every minute. That being the case, do not tie it up in the Treasury, but let it be used for the people; let the people have the money. That is my view of it; and I hope this bill, which is a very good measure, will pass.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question. I see that on page 2 of the bill it provides that "any legally authorized bonds issued for municipal purposes by any city or county in the United States which has been in existence as a city or county for a period of twenty-five years."

I ask the Senator if it is not true that if the bill shall remain in that shape there are ten States which have been admitted into the Union during the last twenty-five years, and that the cities and counties in those ten States would be practically outlawed by the bill?

I understood the Senator to move to strike out "50,000 inhabitants," in line 19, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "10,000 inhabitants." I also understood the Senator to say that he would move to amend the bill on page 2, line 24, by striking out the words:

Or the first-mortgage bonds of any railroad company, not including street-railway bonds, which has paid dividends of not less than 4 per cent per annum regularly and continuously on its entire capital stock for a period of not less than ten years previous to the deposit of the bonds.

I believe the Senator has two amendments pending. One is to strike out "50,000 inhabitants" and insert "10,000 inhabitants"—

Mr. ALDRICH. That has already been adopted.

Mr. CLAY. It has been adopted?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. That will leave the bill, then, as I understand it, so that bonds issued by a city of 10,000 inhabitants can be used as security for national deposits.

Now, I ask the Senator does he think it just that a county or town must have been in existence for twenty-five years in order to enjoy the privileges set forth in this bill? Is it not true that if you take North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, and several other States and the cities and towns in those States, they would not enjoy any of the privileges allowed other States?

Mr. ALDRICH. What number of years would the Senator suggest?

Mr. CLAY. I would not have any number of years. If a State has been organized, and if a county has been organized, and if towns have been organized, it strikes me that there ought not to be a distinction.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President, I do not propose to debate this bill at any length, but I could not get my own consent to permit it to come to a vote without expressing my emphatic dissent from it both in principle and in application.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me for a moment to ask unanimous consent about a matter which pertains to the convenience of a number of Senators?

Mr. TURNER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask unanimous consent that it be agreed that a recess of the Senate shall be taken to-day, and that whenever the recess is taken it shall be until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock, in order that we may have eulogies upon the various members of the House of which notice has been given.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Limiting the session to-morrow to eulogies?

Mr. ALDRICH. Limiting it to eulogies.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I think a statement is due from me. I do not care particularly to object. I do object, however, very strenuously. I have consented to be one of the Senators to deliver a eulogy to-day, and I hardly think at this time we ought to rescind our practice, which we have had so long. I myself agreed to deliver a eulogy to oblige a brother Senator, and out of high regard for the memory of a deceased member. I can not be here to-morrow. I want it publicly understood that I was prepared to perform my part of the sad duty to-day, as this was the time agreed some time ago.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for a moment? I will state that this arrangement is perfectly satisfactory to all the parties interested—that is, the gentlemen who

gave the notices, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. PRITCHARD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], and I hope the Senator will not object to the arrangement. Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator permit me a moment to say one word?

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator let me finish my sentence first? Mr. BERRY. Very well.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] will not object to this arrangement. The Senator must be as well aware as I am, in this stage of the public business, with only a few hours remaining of the session, that to avoid an extraordinary session of Congress it will be necessary for the Senate to remain in session for the transaction of public business. The House of Representatives, if I am permitted to refer to that body, have very wisely and very properly provided that their services of this kind shall be held on Sunday. It seems to me that there can be no good purpose in forcing the Senate to give up discussion and consideration of important business for this occasion, especially as my proposition is satisfactory to the Senators concerned.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I only wish to say a few words personal to myself.

I had promised to submit some remarks to-day in regard to one of the deceased members of the House of Representatives. I am ready to do so to-day, but I can not do so to-morrow. Of course, however, I would not inconvenience or stand in the way of what is the desire of Senators who represent the State from which that member came, and who requested me to make the remarks.

I want to add to what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] has said that, while I am not going to object to the unanimous consent which has been asked, at the same time I do not believe that we should change the practice which has so long existed in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Perhaps it would be proper for the Chair to suggest that in the case of Mr. Cummings, of New York, leave was given that eulogies which were not delivered on the occasion of the commemorative services because of the lack of time or opportunity to do so by Senators might subsequently be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Idaho will withdraw his objection to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I desire to state that if anybody is responsible for legislation being crowded in at the last days of the session I think the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] should bear his share of that responsibility. For fourteen weeks he and his colleagues have discussed a measure here which to-day has 50 votes in its favor in this Senate. They would not permit a vote upon it. They consumed time, one Senator speaking for ten days. And now the Senator comes in here, in the closing days of this session, with a Senate bill which involves a question which has been considered by the people for a great many years in different ways—the elasticity of the currency—a proposition which contemplates that money shall be had when it is wanted, at the time of moving crops, etc. It is a question which the country has not been able to solve satisfactorily, though efforts have been made at different times to present some solution of it. If there is any merit in the bill which the Senator from Rhode Island now proposes, it is that it will prevent stringency in the money market and prevent panics.

I bow to the Senator from Rhode Island. I agree with the splendid article which I saw in the Saturday Evening Post of Philadelphia not long ago headed "The Real Boss of the United States," on the front of which was a magnificent picture of the Senator from Rhode Island. [Laughter.] The article went on to tell the secret of his power, stating it to be that he was the essence of the protection doctrine of the Republican party, and through that he had more power than all the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives combined. The writer dissected the character and ability of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] with great skill and predicted that when it came to the fight now pending in the Republican party—

Mr. BURTON. If I may interrupt the Senator for a moment, I have been requested to make some remarks in the course of the eulogies to be delivered on a late member of the House of Representatives. Do I understand that we are on the eulogies now? [Laughter.]

Mr. DUBOIS. If the Senator from Kansas had done me the honor to listen to me he would have known that I was not delivering a eulogy on a dead man, but paying a tribute to the most lively man in the United States to-day. [Laughter.] At the end of the article to which I have referred, after speaking of the struggle which is taking place in the Republican party between those who want to revise the tariff and those who do not, the writer said that the President of the United States now found himself confronted with the Senator from Rhode Island; that the Senator from Rhode Island will remain here for a number of

years unless a political revolution shall occur; that the Senate was necessary to the occupant of the White House, but that the White House occupant was not necessary to the Senate.

As I have said, the convenience of everybody must be put to one side. The President of the United States has sent special messages here asking that we should pass treaties and that we should pass the Philippine tariff bill. They are not up; but the bill which the Senator from Rhode Island wants to pass is up. He not only led the fight against the omnibus statehood bill, but on his motion the omnibus statehood bill was displaced this morning, only 17 votes being recorded against the motion. I pay tribute to the Senator.

The other Chamber, if I am well informed, is ready for his bill. It is a Senate bill. Numerous amendments are pending to it; it can be again amended in the House of Representatives; the bill, with those amendments, then goes into conference, and perhaps the amendments which go out here now will appear in the bill, and then we shall be in the closing hours of the Congress and nobody must object to the conference report on the bill.

Mr. President, I do not think a measure of this importance should be brought in here as a Senate measure in the closing days of this session, when we can hear from no one except the bankers of New York. I am not objecting to that. I realize fully the importance of the bankers of New York to the country at large. I understand if there is any crisis in New York it affects the entire country. I am willing to give the bankers all power which is consistent with the rights of others, but there are various other interests to be considered in connection with this bill, and they can not be fairly and justly considered at this late day. It is plain to everyone that the Senator from Rhode Island intends to put this bill through now. He has displaced the Philippine bill; he has displaced the treaties; he has his party lined up on the other side to hold on to this bill, no matter if it defeats everything which the President has recommended by special message. The Senator does not, and can not, give time for the consideration of this measure as it should be considered in all its bearings.

Mr. DIETRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DUBOIS. I yield.

Mr. DIETRICH. I wish to state that some days ago the chairman of the Philippine Committee called up the Philippine bill and there was not a single objection to that bill except upon the Democratic side. I understand that all the Republicans are ready and willing to pass that bill.

Mr. DUBOIS. Well, Mr. President, what difference does that make? Does the Senator from Nebraska, who was one of those who stood here for fourteen weeks filibustering, mean to say to us in the closing hours of the session that because the Republicans are now ready to pass a measure which affects the West and the South, "You must keep still; we are ready to pass the bill; do not say anything. We have talked fourteen weeks; we have consumed the time, and now nothing is left for you to do except to accept, without debate, the proposition which we on our side have agreed to; you can not have sufficient and adequate debate in this Chamber on this bill, and you can have none in the other Chamber; it will be put through there under the rules in fifteen minutes." Is that fair?

This is a question, as I say, which the country has been considering in one form or another for years. When you pass your bill, do it after consideration, after all parts of the country have been heard from in regard to it, after they have had an opportunity to digest it and offer what suggestions they think are right about it, taking it up in an orderly way at the beginning of the session, and not in the closing days, when you ask every Senator to lay aside his personal convenience and his feelings in order that you may rush it through.

Mr. President, I do not think that in order to pass a measure of this kind at this time we should change the custom of the Senate and deliver eulogies on deceased members of the other House on Sunday, when we have agreed that they should be delivered to-day. I do not think the situation under all the circumstances justifies us in doing these things.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand the Senator from Idaho to object?

Mr. DUBOIS. I object.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I move that at 6 o'clock to-day the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow, the session to-morrow to be for the delivery of eulogies on deceased members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TURNER. I have no objection to yielding to a request for unanimous consent, but I shall not yield for any motion.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I give notice that later in the day I shall make that motion.

Mr. TURNER. I was proceeding to say, Mr. President, when taken off my feet by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], that I regard this bill as absolutely indefensible on any proper principles of government, and as extending the grossest kind of favoritism to a class in this country who have already been too highly favored by the laws of the United States, and as being extremely indiscreet and inconvenient in the result which it will bring upon this country.

I hope our friends on the other side will consider this bill carefully before they exert their majority to put it upon the statute book, because, to my humble apprehension, it is the most vicious measure which has been introduced in either branch of Congress since I have had the honor to serve in this body.

We had a bill before this body two years ago of malodorous memory, called the ship-subsidy bill. Desperate efforts were made to put that bill upon the statute books of the country. That bill only proposed to take \$9,000,000 a year out of the Treasury as a gift to a few favorite individuals. This bill proposes to take anywhere from one hundred to one hundred and fifty million dollars out of the Treasury of the United States and confer its use upon a few favorite individuals in this country, I venture to say, for all time to come.

This bill comes to us in the specious guise of an amendment of already existing law. It is supposed to be an extension of innocent and meritorious provisions of already existing law. The law to which I refer is one which permits the Government to make deposits of its internal revenues in the national banks of the country as governmental depositories. That law has always been open to very serious question as to its policy and to very serious criticism as to the manner of its execution; but something might be said for it upon the question of policy. The internal revenues of the country are collected throughout the country generally, and it may become important to the Government that it should save the trouble and expense of transferring those revenues to the Federal Government and then back again to remote parts of the country where they may be needed for the purposes of expenditure. That is all that can be said in favor of the law as it exists to-day.

But this bill, Mr. President, proposes to apply this law to all the revenues of the Government, customs as well as internal revenue. It proposes to go further than that—not to deposit these moneys in these banks for the convenience of the Government of the United States, to be drawn out whenever the convenience of the Government may require, but it proposes to go to the extraordinary extent of making a loan to these banks at the rate of 1½ per cent upon securities which have never been regarded as sufficient for such purposes in our legislation heretofore, in order that these banks may loan this money out to the merchant, to the manufacturer, and to the farmer at anywhere from 6 to 8 per cent per annum, the Government receiving, as its compensation for this loan, interest at the rate of 1½ per cent per annum. I do not see how any Senator can get his consent to vote for a measure of this kind.

It is the old subtreasury scheme of the Populist party in principle and in application, except that the beneficiaries of the scheme are not the farmers of the country, but they are the national bankers of the country. That scheme was laughed to scorn by the intelligence of this country, and properly so, and my Republican friends will find that if they now adopt this principle of that scheme, turning it to the benefit of their friends, the bankers of this country, the people of this country, who condemned the subtreasury scheme, will visit an equal condemnation upon them for the adoption of the same scheme in the interest of different beneficiaries.

But it is said, Mr. President, as an additional reason why this extraordinary measure should be adopted that to keep this money in the Treasury will be to cause stringency in the money of the country, which is liable to cause trouble and disaster; but I suggest to my friends on the other side if they want to get this money out into the country let them pay the debts of the Government with it. The money will then be put into circulation and the interest which we are now paying upon those debts will be saved to the national Treasury. If there be no law requiring the application of these surplus moneys in the Treasury to the national debt, then I submit to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that it is just as easy to frame a bill applying these surplus moneys to the national debt as it is to frame this bill which he has framed, to loan it out to the bankers of this country.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I supposed the Senator, with his familiarity with this and all other questions of a similar nature, was aware that there was already upon the statute book the necessary legislation to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to use the money

in the Treasury to pay the debts of the United States. There is a sinking fund there.

Mr. TURNER. I presume that is true. If it be true, then I do not understand why the Secretary of the Treasury has not executed the law and paid these surplus moneys of the Treasury out in liquidation of the national debt instead of keeping them there to form an argument why we should loan them out to the bankers of the country in order that he might prevent stringency in the money market and disaster to the business interests of this country.

I venture to say, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has said, that if we enter upon this policy of loaning out the money of the Government to individuals of any class or character, the time will never come when this Government will feel justified in calling those moneys in.

I have lately been charged, as a member of the Judiciary Committee of this body, with the duty of assisting in the framing of antitrust legislation. It is undoubtedly true that this country is filled with monopolies in the manufacture of all of the necessities of life; that every article of use or convenience in this country is the subject of complete and perfect monopoly; but when we came to deal with the framing of laws for the purpose of curing this great evil, the greatest obstacle that we found, the one that appealed most strongly to every member of the committee, including those who were most earnest in their desire to curb or control or destroy these monopolies, was the fact that in attempting to do so by substantive legislation of serious character and import, the effort was likely to bring panic and disaster to the country; and, if it did not do that, was likely to cause a stoppage in the supply of these useful and necessary articles which these monopolies were furnishing to the country. So that if you once give a special privilege or if you once permit any particular class in this country to take unto themselves a special privilege, you are met with all sorts of obstacles in attempting to deal by law with the evils which arise therefrom.

So with this measure: Let this money be put out among the national banks at an interest rate instead of being deposited subject to the call of the Government at a moment's notice; let that condition of affairs continue for a few years, and you will be met here upon the floor of the Senate and the floor of the other House with the proposition that any attempt to call these moneys into the Treasury will result in panic and disaster. And probably if you attempt to do so—if you should get a President of the character of Andrew Jackson, who looks at the interests of the Government rather than at the interests of wealth and corporations, who undertakes, when the interests of the Government require it, to call in this money—then you are very liable to have panic and disaster. The time to avoid these things is right now, when the Congress of the United States is invited to enter upon that species of legislation which may bring about such results.

Another reason why this legislation ought not to pass is that it is lending the strength of this Government to the bolstering up of a certain class of securities with which we have nothing to do; which ought to stand upon their own merits or rise and fall upon their own bottoms. It would not be so bad if this were confined, in addition to the bonds of the United States, to the bonds of States, counties, and municipal corporations; but when the Congress of the United States goes into the business of bolstering up the bonds of the railroad companies of this country, then it has taken an extraordinary step; and while you are bolstering up the bonds of the railroads of the country by this class of legislation you are bearing down and depressing the bonds of the Government of the United States by taking away from them that exclusive use which has heretofore been given to them and which has resulted in giving them a very great portion of the value which they now have in the markets of this country.

These reasons seem to me, Mr. President, to be conclusive against the policy and against the principle of this bill. If it shall be forced as a law by the votes of a Republican majority in this Congress, it will be simply another evidence to my mind and another evidence to the mind and the apprehension of the people of this country, and it will not require many evidences of that kind to bring conviction to their minds, that the Republican party in this country is wedded to the trusts and the corporations and the money power, and that it proposes to wield its control of the country in their interests rather than in the interests of the common people of this land.

We had the extraordinary spectacle yesterday of the Republican majority in this Chamber voting down the consideration of the antitrust bill, which received careful consideration by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives; which passed that body almost unanimously; which came here and was considered by the Judiciary Committee of this body; which was reported to the Senate more than ten days ago, and which has been pending here for consideration and action ever since.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TURNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose there is no Senator who has given more attention to the antitrust bill than I have, and I suppose there is no Senator who more earnestly desires its consideration than I do. I do not mean that there may not in discussion turn out to be serious defects in it which should be amended, but in the main I think it a healthy and valuable piece of legislation. I voted against taking it up because to take it up would not at that time, as everybody in the Senate knows perfectly, have resulted in its passage, but would only have displaced a treaty which, it seemed to me, we were bound by the strongest considerations of national good faith to consider and dispose of at once.

Mr. TURNER. Well, I do not know why the Senator assumes that if the trust bill had received consideration on yesterday it would not have passed the Senate. I do not know whether it would or not.

Mr. HOAR. I did not say that it would not have passed. I said it would have displaced a treaty. The Senator can judge himself whether in the brief time at our command we could have passed it. If we could, I should have been glad to do it.

Mr. TURNER. I understood the Senator to say the only effect of the vote in taking up that bill would have been to have secured its consideration, without hope of its passage, at the expense of the treaty. Now, I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, whether this bill now under consideration has not displaced the same treaty?

Mr. HOAR. I do not think it has.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Then, how would the other bill have done so?

Mr. TURNER. Has that treaty yet been ratified?

Mr. HOAR. As I understand it, the conflict on which we voted yesterday was a conflict between going into executive session and the consideration of a conference report.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HOAR. What was it, then?

Mr. BLACKBURN. My motion was to stop the procedure on the conference report made by the Senator from Massachusetts and proceed to the consideration of the antitrust bill.

Mr. HOAR. I was thinking for the moment that it was a conflict between going into executive session and the conference report.

Mr. BLACKBURN. It was the Senator's own conference report on the bill for the protection of the President which I antagonized.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

Mr. TURNER. I do not care anything about that. I have said all I wanted to say on this floor, except I was proceeding to point out the course of our Republican friends on yesterday in voting down the consideration of the antitrust bill—a bill in the interest of the people of this country, a bill to prevent the trusts and the combines from going down into their pockets elbow deep and gouging them, as they have been doing for the last five or ten years—the contrast between that action and the ready action of the same majority this morning in bringing up, by the same Republican votes, for consideration and passage this bill, which is manifestly not in the interest of the common people of the land, but in the interest of the national bankers of the land. If our Republican friends want to take that onus, that burden, that responsibility upon their shoulders, they are entitled to take it. I bid them Godspeed in the job.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I expect to vote for this bill. I expect to vote for it because the purpose for which it is framed seems to me to be a good one, and because of my great respect and deference for some of the persons who are responsible for framing it and for some men not responsible for framing it, but whose judgment and patriotism are entitled to the profoundest respect.

But I confess I feel great anxiety that this policy, which leaves it in the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to affect public business in times of great monetary pressure, shall not be carried too far. In the first place, it is putting into the hands of a dishonest or unwise official an enormous power over the business of the country.

I do not now speak of this particular law, but of the general power of the Secretary of the Treasury to interpose in times of special excitement. That power has been wielded in the past with very great and salutary effect, I think, in every case where the Treasury has interposed, from the time of the Black Friday down to the present time. But it is a dangerous power, and even if it be wielded wisely and discreetly, the result is that the existing Government is held responsible by the public; is held responsible, if it can be done, by its antagonists for everything that goes wrong in financial matters. Whenever there is a panic or a pinch the clamor is raised that the Treasury Department or the banks are responsible.

Now, they do this thing in general better in England. The Bank of England is not the Government. It is not controlled by the Government. If the Bank of England does anything extraordinary in time of commercial danger, all the Government does, if it be necessary afterwards, is to secure the directors from personal liability for violation of law: to indemnify them.

Mr. President, I hope that the efforts of financiers like the honorable Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and other gentlemen who are to succeed them in this body, will be directed toward divorcing the Government of the United States from any relation to the financial conditions of the country.

This bill contains no protection against favoritism. The only protection there is against favoritism as against communities or individual banks is in the wisdom and discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] offered an amendment. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Massachusetts was listening when it was read.

Mr. HOAR. I have not seen the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Perhaps we had better have the amendment read.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have it read. I was about to say that I hoped some emphatic declaration of that purpose might get into the bill before it was finally disposed of.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Georgia offered an amendment which I was inclined to accept. I should like to have it read.

Mr. HOAR. I should be glad to have the Secretary read it now, if the Chair please.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be read.

Mr. HOAR. I retain the floor.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of section 1:

That as far as practicable the Secretary of the Treasury shall fairly distribute the deposits herein authorized throughout the country.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. That removes the difficulty to a certain extent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. HOAR. At any rate it is an effort in the right direction.

There is one other practical consideration which I should like to suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island. I have had some experience in former days by reason of a professional relation to various banks that have been in trouble and difficulty, and there is a very uncomfortable condition so far as concerns depositors in such institutions (and the same applies to all cases of sureties on bonds to the Government) growing out of the fact that the assets are tied up in case of embarrassment, and they must await the action of the United States. No estate of a deceased person or of an insolvent person can ever be settled when there is an obligation held by the United States, and a great deal of trouble and injustice arises.

Now, in this amendment, on the third page, it is provided that "the United States shall have a lien on the current assets of banks." I suppose that means every available property of the banks. There is no provision made as to how the lien shall be enforced, but I suppose it will be enforced by some equity process instituted in behalf of the Government.

The United States shall have a lien on the current assets of banks in which public moneys are deposited for the repayment of the same—

That is, the public money—

on demand of the Treasurer of the United States as aforesaid; but the securities deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury for the safe-keeping of such moneys shall be sold before the said lien is enforced.

The depositor may be a person of small means. He will have to wait first until a legal proceeding has been instituted, and that legal proceeding can not be begun until the Treasurer of the United States chooses to enforce the lien and liquidate the claim of the United States. I have an amendment here.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. HOAR. I move this amendment, to be inserted at the end of section 1:

But the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, permit such assets, or any part thereof, to be applied to the discharge of the other obligations of the bank to which they are lawfully applicable if, in his judgment, that may be done consistently with the security of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should be glad to have the amendment adopted. I think it is a very wise one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is not in order at this time. The Senator from Tennessee has offered an amendment, which is the pending amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. On behalf of the committee I will accept this amendment so far as I can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island accepts the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. I desire to inquire whether an amendment is now in order. If so, I desire to offer one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not in order at the present time as there is an amendment pending. It will be in order a little later on.

Mr. BERRY. Has the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts been agreed to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of line 22, section 1, the following:

But the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, permit such assets, or any part thereof, to be applied to the discharge of the other obligations of the bank to which they are lawfully applicable if, in his judgment, that may be done consistently with the security of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is accepted by the Senator from Rhode Island. The amendment pending now is the one offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BERRY. Has the Senator from Massachusetts concluded his remarks?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3560) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to couple their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1893, and amended April 1, 1896.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 6139) to provide for the organization of private corporations in the district of Alaska.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION.

Mr. BERRY. As there is neither treaty nor conference report now pending, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the measure known as the Littlefield antitrust bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be read.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 17) requiring corporations engaged in interstate commerce to make returns, prohibiting rebates and discriminations and the use of interstate commerce in attempts to destroy competition, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DUBOIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi (when the name of Mr. MONEY was called). By arrangement with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] my colleague [Mr. MONEY] stands paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

Mr. TALIAFERRO (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I am paired with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS]. With the consent of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO], I will transfer my pair to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] and will vote.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It is agreeable to me.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I vote "nay."

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I notice that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] is absent. So I withdraw my vote, being paired with him.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 41; as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon,	Cockrell,	Mallory,	Rawlins,
Bailey,	Daniel,	Martin,	Simmons,
Bate,	Gibson,	Mason,	Taliaferro,
Berry,	Heitfeld,	Morgan,	Teller,
Blackburn,	Hoar,	Nelson,	Turner,
Carmack,	Jones, Ark.	Patterson,	Vest.
Clark, Mont.	McEnery,	Perkins,	
Clay,	McLaurin, Miss.	Pettus,	

NAYS—41.

Aldrich,	Deboe,	Gamble,	Platt, Conn.
Alger,	Depew,	Hale,	Platt, N. Y.
Allison,	Dietrich,	Hanna,	Proctor,
Bard,	Dolliver,	Hansbrough,	Simon,
Beveridge,	Dryden,	Jones, Nev.	Spooner,
Burnham,	Elkins,	Kean,	Stewart,
Burrows,	Fairbanks,	Kearns,	Warren,
Burton,	Foraker,	Kittredge,	Wetmore.
Clapp,	Foster, Wash.	Lodge,	
Clark, Wyo.	Frye,	McComas,	
Cullom,	Gallinger,	Millard,	

NOT VOTING—17.

Culberson,	Hawley,	Penrose,	Tillman,
Dillingham,	McCumber,	Pritchard,	Wellington.
Dubois,	McLaurin, S. C.	Quarles,	
Foster, La.	Mitchell,	Quay,	
Harris,	Money,	Scott,	

So the Senate refused to consider the bill.

SAFE-KEEPING OF PUBLIC MONEY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 7301) to further provide for the safe-keeping of public money, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as I shall probably find myself differing with a majority of my political associates on this bill, I desire briefly to state the reasons which will induce me to vote for its passage. According to my view of it, neither the principle nor the policy of the national banking act is involved in it; but it presents simply the question of what shall be done with money collected by the Government. Shall it be locked in the vaults of the Treasury and thus be withdrawn from circulation, or shall it be deposited in the banks and thus be available for the uses of trade?

If I were permitted to frame the laws of this Republic, the Government would have no surplus to dispose of, because I would so frame those laws that nothing more would be collected from the people in the way of taxes than is necessary to provide for the economical administration of the Government. A hundred times in my life I have assailed the Republican party for its system of taxation, against which I have alleged a twofold injustice. I have asserted, first, that it was an injustice against the taxpayer in that it compelled him to contribute more than was necessary toward the support of the Government. And I have alleged, in the second place, that it was an injury to the business interests of the country in that it removed from the channels of commerce and trade money which was needed for its uses.

If I had my way I would correct at one and the same time and by a single law the injustice against the taxpayer and the injury to the trade of the country. But as I can not have my way and discontinue the collection of what I consider an unnecessary revenue, and can not relieve the taxpayer of his unjust burden, I intend at least to make the other part of my contention good by voting to restore, in the only way possible under existing law, to the channels of circulation the money which I think the Government unnecessarily collects. I venture to say there is not a Senator on this side of the Chamber who would to-morrow, if given the power, take the responsibility of withdrawing from the commerce of this country \$300,000,000.

The natural instinct of every Democratic Senator is to vote against every measure proposed by a Republican Senator. I myself share that. Always my first impulse is to vote against any proposition the other side presents. My friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] says to me I am justified in suspecting it. [Laughter.] But when there is presented a plain business proposition I propose to meet it—decide it upon its merits. As sensible business men we deposit our money in the banks when we do not need it, and most of us when we do need it, because it is more convenient to check it out in payment of our daily transactions than it is to carry it in our pockets, and I can see no good reason why the Government should not do the same.

The policy of depositing public money is not up for discussion even now, because that is the existing policy of the Government. Already it is authorized to place certain collections on deposit, and if any living man can give me any rational distinction between money collected from internal-revenue sources and money collected from customs, as the matter stands to-day, I should like to hear the explanation.

There was a time, possibly, when specie payments were involved, that there was a proper distinction; but there is none today. If it is just and proper for the Government to deposit in the banks money which it collects as internal-revenue taxes I should like to hear some good reason why it is not equally just and proper to deposit likewise the money which it receives in customs dues.

This bill commends itself to my mind for another reason. It not only puts the money collected from the people back into the channels of circulation, but it compels the bonds of the United States to share with the bonds of States, counties, and municipalities a privilege that it now exclusively enjoys. Our friends talk about special classes and special privileges. They ought to recollect that in voting for this bill to-day we vote to compel the bonds of the United States Government to share what is now their exclusive privilege of being deposited as security for the public funds with the bonds of the cities, counties, and municipalities of this entire country.

As the bill was originally introduced, I shared the very general prejudice against the proposition to accept railroad bonds, and yet that was more sentimental than substantial, because if the Government is going to leave this money on deposit for the purpose of allowing it still to be available for the uses of trade, then it is a question of security, not the kind of security except where the kind is related to the sufficiency. We had just as well be frank with ourselves and say that there is a good deal of demagoguery in the objection to any kind of security that is sufficient.

There is an amendment reported by the committee to which I object. It is the provision that gives the Government a first lien upon the assets of the bank as against all other depositors. The Government takes a special security for its deposit, and the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to demand more security is ample, if what he has becomes impaired. Not content with that, it is further proposed the Government shall have a prior lien over the widow who had her last dollar deposited in that bank. In other words, the Government, with a power to take a collateral security, asserts and enforces a lien against the very money you have deposited in the bank.

My objection is not only practical but it is also rather theoretical. Undoubtedly the Government has ample power and a perfect right to say to the banks that before they can receive its money on deposit they must give it a special security. But I do not believe the Government ought to go further and, projecting itself between the bank and its depositors, vary the contract which exists to-day between every bank and every depositor on its books. As the law now stands, every depositor stands on an equal footing with every other depositor. That is a contractual relation between the banks and their depositors, and whatever may be the authority of the Government to exact ample or more than ample security as against the bank, I do not believe it just and wise for the Government to violate the contract of every bank with its depositors and assert for itself a prior lien as against them.

Another provision in the bill that I should prefer to have stricken out is the provision for interest. I believe that it would be better to avoid all question about the Government loaning money as contradistinguished from depositing it. By simply depositing its money and requiring the bank to perform whatever services a bank usually performs for one of its depositors, we would avoid a feature which serves to confuse the real nature of the transaction and allows it to be charged that the Government is loaning its money to the banks, when as a matter of fact the Government is only depositing it.

Of course some gentlemen will say a deposit is a loan, but my experience with the banks is that a loan is different from a deposit. I am sometimes a depositor; I am frequently a borrower, and I have discovered the difference between a loan and a deposit on more than one occasion.

It looks to me like it would be well for us to preserve what is actually a difference between a deposit and a loan, and as it is not the practice of the banks usually to pay interest on deposits, I have a belief that they ought not to be permitted to do so here. They ought to have no moral claim upon the Government for the use of this money. They ought not to be able to look a Treasury official in the face and say, "I am paying you interest on this deposit;" but they ought to be made the mere servants or agents of the Government, leaving its officers to demand its funds whenever the public convenience or safety may require it.

I know it is easy to arouse a certain popular prejudice by claiming that you are according privileges to the banks. For so widely used an institution the banks are the most extensively abused in the world. You could no more progress under this civilization and this commerce without banks of discount and deposit than you could proceed without railroads, or factories, or storehouses. I have no prejudice against them. There is not a Senator in this Chamber who hesitates to use them whenever his business or

even his personal convenience requires, and surely it can not be that they ought to be feared and dreaded, and that they ought to be assailed and denounced whenever it becomes necessary for the Government to touch them in any of its relations.

Let us be frank, not only with ourselves, but with the country. The only argument against this is that it is an advantage to the banks. Suppose you grant it, although the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] says that the banks in the city of Chicago are almost unanimously opposed to it. I myself happen to know that the Senator on this side of the Chamber who is most largely interested in national banks is an earnest opponent of the bill. But it makes no difference to me whether the banks favor or oppose its passage. Let us suppose that it is an advantage to the banks. I have no objection to it on that account, provided it is no disadvantage to the people. If it is no disadvantage to the people, then I have no objection to it because it is an advantage to the banks.

I denounce a special privilege to any man and every man, because a special privilege to one implies a special burden on the other. If by some legislative enactment I could make every man in the country rich and happy I would be glad to pass a law to do it. The reason why I vote against all laws to increase the fortunes of one man is because I know the law creates no wealth, and, therefore, when it confers wealth upon one it can only do so by taking wealth from another who has created it.

When Senators tell me that this bill is a benefit to the banks they only half state the case. They must also tell me that it is an injury to the people. If it is, I vote against it. If it is not, I cheerfully and unhesitatingly vote for it.

Now the question is, is it to the advantage of the people of the United States that the Government should lock its money in its Treasury vaults and deny them the use of it in their trade and commerce? No man contends it. Then is it to the advantage of the people of the United States that the Government should place this money where they can enjoy its use, even though they have to pay a reasonable rate of interest? That is unquestionably true. Believing so, no apprehension that I may be charged with favoring the banks can deter me from giving to the people of the United States the use of the largest amount of circulation.

My friend from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] and myself a few years ago, fighting side by side, insisted that the country needed more money. I still think it needs more, but he parts company with me.

Mr. STEWART. Oh, no.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to know that my friend has not come to the conclusion that the increase in the production of gold has given us all we need. He agrees with me that though money is more abundant than it was and consequently the times are better, we still do not have enough to be able to lock it up in the Treasury vaults.

Mr. STEWART. That is right.

Mr. BAILEY. To my friends on this side of the Chamber I will say in conclusion that with denunciations on our lips against our opponents because they would not give the country more money we ought not to vote to lock up any part of what we have.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am quite sure, Mr. President, that I was sorry, sincerely sorry, when a short time ago divergence and separation occurred between my two friends, the one from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the other from Nevada [Mr. STEWART]; and I do not know whether I can conscientiously say that I am glad now to see those estranged comrades once more united. I was surprised at the separation, and I have scarcely yet grown familiar with the reconciliation.

The Senator from Texas (and there is not a man in this Chamber or in this land who holds in higher esteem his deliberate opinion than I) says that he would like to make every man rich in this land by law if that were possible, but the law does not make wealth if legitimately enacted and applied. I agree with that. Yet here is a law which proposes to allow to a railroad corporation (I select that simply for purposes of illustration) of a certain description set out in this bill, that has been paying consistently dividends of not less than 4 per cent for a term of ten years next preceding, the deposit of their first-mortgage bonds. I quote, I think, the provisions of the bill. Is it a fair law that allows me to take those railroad bonds and deposit them as collateral with the Government and upon that deposit take out money at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent? Is not that law necessarily to result, if, indeed, it was not intended—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Kentucky allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BLACKBURN. With the greatest pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. What does the Senator mean by "taking out money?" He used that expression.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I had just as well define that right here and right now, so that the Senator from Rhode Island and myself will not misunderstand each other any further. I admit that the money provided for by this bill is to be taken from the vaults of the

Treasury and put into circulation. It is not new money. It is not new money—a new bill—that is to be issued. It is old money, that by process of taxation has been withdrawn from circulation and is locked up in the coffers of the Government.

When I say that the deposit of that railroad bond is as a collateral upon which to take out money, I do not mean to be understood that new money is to be issued and brought into existence upon that deposit, but I mean that that amount of money which has been abstracted from circulation, which has become dormant and dead as the gold that has never yet been brought from the bowels of the earth for all processes of business, is to be dragged from its hiding place in the vaults of the Treasury and put into circulation, for which the banker is to pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest, and on its circulation he is to get neither you nor I nor anybody except the Lord and that banker know what rate of interest.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit me?

Mr. BLACKBURN. With the greatest pleasure.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not likewise true that when the Senator from Kentucky deposits money in the bank the banker loans it out the same way and pays him nothing?

Mr. BLACKBURN. That is true; but my money is there on call, if I am lucky enough to have any.

Mr. BAILEY. This is, too; this is on call.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Wait; I am coming to that. I trust the Senator from Texas will not be impatient. Whether my views are of any value to him or to anybody else, he shall have the full opportunity of knowing what they are before I sit down. It is not my purpose to discuss this bill at length, but I am not willing that it shall be voted upon and perhaps enacted into law, so far as this Chamber is concerned, without entering my protest against its passage, and in my own feeble way submitting the reasons which have led me to that conclusion.

I am opposed to the national banking system and always have been. I admit that it has many exceptional features which commend it to my approval. In the matter of security, whether it be to the depositor or to the holder, I believe that it is an admirable system of banking. But I have insuperable and vital objections to that system of banking. Hence, to be consistent, I have insuperable objections to this bill because, as I see it, the bill is simply an enlargement of the powers of the national banking system of this country. Whatever is objectionable to me in that system of national banking of necessity is objectionable to me in this bill, because this is an enlargement of it.

As the national banking system of this country stands to-day there is a limit to the exercise of its power, to which I object, and that limit is found in the amount of Government bonds that they can get possession of, for beyond it they can not go. They can get no money upon which to do a national banking business except that money is based upon the deposit of national bonds.

Here is a proposition to enlarge their powers in that direction, to say that they shall have what they have to-day, the right to take out currency upon the deposit of national bonds, plus the right to take out money upon the deposit as collateral of State or county or municipal or certain railroad bonds described in this act.

But the passage of this bill is demanded for reasons that force us to face two propositions which may not be denied. First, there is a congestion of money in the Treasury. I admit it. I believe the amount is some \$300,000,000, all told. The advocates of this measure say that that money is of no value in the channels of trade and commerce. I admit it. The advocates of this measure say that we are in this fix; that there is \$300,000,000, or whatever the amount may be, of idle capital in the Treasury, and that our purpose in this bill is to bring it back and put it into active circulation.

That situation is not denied, but that situation prompts me to ask one or two questions. How came it that we are in that predicament? What is it that brought about the congestion of money in the vaults of the Federal Treasury? There can be but one answer given by honest men. Excessive taxation, producing a disproportion between the receipts and the expenditures of the Government, is the only explanation that can be vouchsafed or answer given to that question.

Now, admitting that this is the condition we are in; that we are collecting more money than we need for governmental purposes; that by this high rate of taxation we are taking out of the channels of commerce and trade this amount of money that the people need to carry on their business and conduct their commerce, is this the only means to correct the evil? Is this the best way? Is it modest, is it fair, for our friends on the other side to come to us and say, "We passed the tariff laws under which this country is to-day laboring; we have extracted from the pockets of the producing classes of this country a surplus of revenue that runs up to-day into the hundreds of millions; we have put you in this pocket, and now we insist that you shall let us prescribe the remedy and devise the way in which you are to be gotten out?"

I say that this is not the best way to remedy the situation.

There is an open road before us. There is no want of statutory authority that we might follow. The law to-day confers ample power upon the Secretary of the Treasury to invest this plethora of revenue in the purchase and retirement of the United States Government bonds, which are its evidence of debt.

There is not one of these bonds to-day that is not drawing a higher rate of interest than you are going to exact from the beneficiaries of this bill for the use of this surplus money. What would be said of me or you in the proper transaction of our private business if we owe a debt upon which we are paying 3 or 4 per cent interest if we should turn around and loan our surplus money at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and pay the higher rate which is being charged against us?

Mr. STEWART. Would it be a complete remedy for that to sell the bonds?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I have not got through. I hope my friend will wait until I do.

Mr. STEWART. Would that be a complete remedy? We must have a surplus all the time, and if you invest in bonds there would be a deficiency and a panic. We can not invest all our surplus in bonds. We must keep enough money on hand to give confidence.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. BLACKBURN. We can not invest it in bonds, the Senator says, because there will be a deficiency. So long as the present rate of taxation continues there will never be a deficiency in the Treasury, notwithstanding the lavish hand with which appropriations have recently been made by Republican Congresses.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator think all this money should be paid out?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I do not; but I say that a reasonable discretion should be employed. And I will answer the Senator from Nevada that, if there is no more surplus in the Treasury to-day than ought to be there, then why this complaint? Why tender us this bill? If you have not got an awkward and an inconvenient, if not a dangerous, surplus in the vaults of the Treasury, where is the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. STEWART. We do not want the money tied up.

Mr. BLACKBURN. The Senator has just this minute told me that he did want a margin held; but I hope my friend will make his argument in his own time and let me get through, for I do not want to detain the Senate.

Mr. President, it may be answered that the bonds are at a premium. Very well. Are they likely to go lower? Not while the credit of this Government stands good. You can not get away from this proposition. Why not be candid? Why not tell the truth? Let those who attempt the passage of this bill answer me—Is it true that there is an element in this country, and a potential element at that, who do not want those bonds canceled or retired or the debt of this Government ever to be paid? Is there a reason why there should be such an element in our country? Let us look at the facts and answer.

What constitutes the foundation upon which the national bank system was builded and rests to-day? The Government debt, as evidenced by that Government's bonds. Pay off the last of this Government's debt and you will have retired and canceled the last of this Government's bonds, and the national bank system topples to the earth because its foundation has been pulled from under it. You can not have a national bank system unless you have a national debt on which to build it as the rock of its foundation.

May it not be true, Mr. President, that there are people in this country, and potential, too, in proportion to their numbers, who never want the national debt paid off, because, if you do that, the privileges of the national banks are gone. You dare not pay the debt in full. The only country on the earth to-day, with a Treasury bursting to overflowing, which does not undertake to retire the obligations which it has out against its credit and against its resources—

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator be good enough to mention any other government than ours that does that?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I have just this moment said there was not another government upon earth that did do it, and I do not believe that another government on earth would propose to do it.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator to say that this Government did not do what other governments did—that is, pay off its debts or obligations.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Oh, no; the Senator did not hear me.

Mr. HOAR. I heard the Senator, but I may not have heard him correctly.

Mr. BLACKBURN. The Senator did not hear me correctly. I stated that so far—

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator to say that this Government did not dare to pay off its debt because it would take out from the national banks the foundation on which they stood. I understood him to say that this Government did not do what every other government did—retire its obligations. Now, I ask the Senator if he will mention another government that does retire its obligations, except ours, which has done it more than any or all the countries of the world put together, under the Republican policies of the last generation?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am always delighted, Mr. President, I am always entertained, and I am always instructed when I hear the Senator from Massachusetts on any subject, but he has in this case builded a man of straw, in order that he might knock it down, and to that I have no objection.

I did not make the statement that the Senator from Massachusetts understood me to make, but, for his accommodation, I will come this near making it right now, for the first time. I will say that, so far as my information goes, this is the only Government on this earth, either in this epoch of the world's history or in any previous period of that world's history, that has ever found itself provided with surplus revenues for which it had no use, that were lying dormant, idle, dead, that did not apply them to the extinguishment of its debts.

Now, Mr. President, I insist that the best way for an honest man—and the argument that applies to the individual applies with equal if not greater force to the nation—I insist that the best way for an honest man to employ surplus money for which he has no use is in paying his honest debts that are drawing a big interest, instead of loaning it to his neighbor for a less interest than he is required to pay. That may not be modern-day financing; that may not be the theory upon which Wall street conducts its business—I am not an expert in their questionable methods of transaction—but as a plain, uninitiated representative of the uninitiated and honest people of this country, I insist upon forcing the proposition here and now; if you have got money in your Treasury that you have no use for, pay your debts that are drawing 3 per cent interest, instead of loaning it out to the national banker at 1½ per cent, in order that the banker may loan it at 6 or 8 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLACKBURN. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Kentucky must be aware of the fact that within the last generation the United States has paid more than two thousand millions of its public debt under Republican policies and methods against the protests of the Democratic party at every step and against their action at every step; and there is not another civilized country in the world that has not only not reduced its debts, but all of those countries have increased their debts, while we have reduced ours, as I have said, under Republican policies and against the protests of the Democratic party.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will answer the Senator. "I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word." I might, I doubtless should have forgotten to make the point which the Senator enables me to make right now. I admit that the governments of Europe, the older governments of the world, which are saddled with expenditures for the maintenance of military establishments of which we can not conceive, have as a rule failed to reduce their debts, but have increased them and are to-day increasing them. I admit that this Government has reduced its debt, not by reason of Republican policies, but in spite of those policies, which, by your own confession, have extorted from the pockets of the American people hundreds of millions of money beyond all that you have done in the nature of debt reduction.

Mr. DIETRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BLACKBURN. Does the Senator rise for a question or for a speech?

Mr. DIETRICH. For a question.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am more than glad to have the Senator ask a question.

Mr. DIETRICH. Twenty-eight years ago we were collecting a duty of 5 cents per pound upon coffee and 50 per cent ad valorem on rubber—

Mr. BLACKBURN. Is that the question?

Mr. DIETRICH. Yes, that is the question. We placed those articles upon the free list, and the government of the country from whom we purchased those articles put an export tax upon those articles equal to the amount that we took off at this end. Did we gain anything by that transaction?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I do not see, Mr. President, that that has the slightest bearing upon what I was talking about. I am not discussing the tariff question here; I am not discussing the difference between an allopathic fashion of arranging tariff duties and the homeopathic fashion, to which the Senator now alludes, and I do not intend to be deflected into a tariff debate. If I were, I

should only say that, as a general proposition, my objection to the doctrine of reciprocity—which the Senator's party claims to favor, but fails to put it into execution—is that it is Democratic free-trade doctrine taken after a homeopathic fashion, and for that reason I do not like it.

So I do not care what the effect was upon the Federal Treasury by the proposition stated by the Senator from Nebraska. I am dealing with a separate question. I am dealing with a fact, conceded on all sides here. The credit for the enactment of the tax laws which are to-day upon the statute books of this country is altogether to be given to the Republican party. There is not a tariff or a tax law, whether it be the customs or the internal-revenue tax law, on our statute books to-day that our Republican friends did not put there. If these laws have worked well, you can take all the credit that attaches to you for their enactment; if they have resulted in a condition of which you now complain, be manly and assume the responsibility for having brought about that condition.

What are you complaining of here by the presentation of this bill? You gathered the three hundred millions of surplus money in the vaults of the Treasury. How did it get there? Because somebody collected too much taxes from the people. Who did it? Who made the law under which the taxgatherer has taken from the pockets of the producing classes of this land the money which you now want to loan out practically as a gratuity to certain favored classes of individuals?

Mr. President, the question is right here, and it can not be avoided. If you pass this bill, you declare that you would rather perpetuate the national debt and pay 3 per cent yearly interest upon your bonds than to use money for which you have no use in the discharge of that debt, and to loan it at 1½ per cent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] say that this is the only Government that has of late years been reducing its national debt. For that you are entitled to credit; but in heaven's name why do you not go on with it?

Mr. ALDRICH. We have been going on with it within the last three months.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Why do you not put that \$300,000,000 to the credit of the nation against its obligations outstanding in the shape of bonds?

Mr. ALDRICH. We have very largely reduced the national debt.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Why do you not continue to reduce it until you have extinguished it?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is nothing in this bill to prevent its extinguishment.

Mr. BLACKBURN. No; the law already authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the national debt, but he will not execute that authority, that discretion. Now, instead of passing this bill, why not pass another statute making it obligatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury whenever—not in his discretion—but whenever the surplus in the vaults of the Treasury exceeds a given amount to use that surplus above a certain conservative amount that you may fix upon to retire the obligations of this Government's debt?

I ask the Senator from Massachusetts now is it not true, can he or will he deny, that the very instant that this national debt is paid off and these bonds are canceled the national banking system is a thing of the past?

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I rose to ask the Senator a question, but I will first answer the one he put to me.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would rather the Senator would answer, if he is going to speak at length, in his own time.

Mr. HOAR. I will first answer the question the Senator put to me, and then I will ask the one I rose to put to him.

I have not the slightest doubt that if every national debt were wiped out this afternoon another foundation for the business of national banking would be supplied which would enable it to go on to the satisfaction, to the convenience, and to the advantage of the people. So I answer the Senator's question by saying that I do not think the national banking system would be destroyed in the manner he suggests.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Does the Senator mean to say—

Mr. HOAR. I will ask the Senator the question—

Mr. BLACKBURN. Well, I want the Senator to complete his answer to me.

Mr. HOAR. I will do so.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Does the Senator mean to say that if this national debt was paid and the last of the nation's bonds were canceled there would be any foundation left for the present fabric of the national banking system?

Mr. HOAR. Of course there would be.

Mr. BLACKBURN. What would it be?

Mr. HOAR. The National Bank of England and the old Massachusetts banking system—

Mr. BLACKBURN. I said in existence to-day.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator mean to say that there being at this moment but one foundation for the national banking system, if that foundation were destroyed, it would still be there? I did not understand him to ask that question.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I did not. I asked the Senator this question—

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. BLACKBURN. No; I insist that my question shall be correctly stated. I asked the Senator from Massachusetts if there was any foundation upon which the present national banking system of this country rested to-day except the national bonds, the evidences of the national debt.

Mr. HOAR. That is the question in substance that I have just said the Senator put to me. If the Senator asks me if the national banking system does rest now on Government bonds, I say yes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. That is what I asked.

Mr. HOAR. Very well; but I understood him to ask me—I think my hearing did not deceive me—what would happen if that foundation were destroyed.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOAR. What foundation we would have?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOAR. Then, whether the Senator asked me that question or not, let me answer it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. No; I will answer for the Senator. I did not ask any such question, because I have as abiding a faith as the Senator from Massachusetts has in the conviction that if we were to pay off the last national bond this day, strike down all, tearing from under it the last vestige of foundation on which the national banking system of this country rests, I am as thoroughly persuaded as the Senator from Massachusetts can be that the dominant party in power in this country now, within a very short time, probably twenty-four hours, would exhaust both human and devilish ingenuity to furnish another one that would be the counterpart of the one with which we are now dealing.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, many of the national banks do business now without any circulation at all and without any foundation of bonds. Other national banks are going out of business rapidly because there is not money enough to be made on their circulation on bonds to warrant their keeping on. They are giving place to trust companies.

I think if the Senator will look at the report of his question tomorrow he will find that he did put the question that I thought he did; but let that pass.

I want to ask a question of the Senator now. Will he tell the Senate what bonds there are now in existence that the Government of the United States can pay without great sacrifice?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I have already tried to answer that question.

Mr. HOAR. I have not heard the answer. Perhaps the Senator will state it again.

Mr. BLACKBURN. The Senator did not do me the honor of listening. I said that it might be answered that the Secretary of the Treasury would find himself at this disadvantage, that none of our outstanding bonds have matured and can be called in at the pleasure of the Government, and that, consequently, the Secretary of the Treasury would have to go into the open market, the open street, and pay a premium upon these bonds. That I concede; of course that is true; but as against that premium he would have to pay I offered this liberal percentage, and then, supplementing that, I offered the suggestion that it is much safer for an honest man or an honest people or an honest nation to invest its surplus and idle moneys in the discharge of its own debts than to loan it out to other people at a nominal rate of interest.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator said, as I understood him, or assumed, that instead of lending this money, as is proposed by this bill, or depositing it, the Secretary ought to pay debts with it. Will the Senator tell me if he were Secretary of the Treasury would he proceed to pay debts with it; and if so, what debts, and what would it cost him to pay them?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am more than happy to answer the Senator; but I want to say, Mr. President, that if there is one reputation that I am less anxious about attaining than any other it is that of a long-winded speaker in the Senate. I did not expect to be on this floor five minutes, certainly not ten, and I would not have been but for questions.

Now I will answer the question of the Senator from Massachusetts. If I were Secretary of the Treasury, with the law staring me in the face, as it is to-day staring him in the face, and clothing him with undisputed, ample, and plenary power to buy the

bonds of this Government with the surplus revenues in the Treasury, I would buy them, and I would send a communication to both Houses of your Republican Congress, and I would tell you that I intended to keep buying them so long as I had a dollar for which I had no use until that Republican Congress reduced the rates of taxation and quit piling up surplus revenue upon my hands as the bonded official of this Government. That is what I would do.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator would do that even if the bonds cost him 25 or 30 per cent premium?

Mr. BLACKBURN. No; but has the Senator any right to predicate that question upon the quotations of the market? Can he point to a bond that commands that price?

Mr. HOAR. I can point to plenty of bonds that command a price that would make it a bad business to buy them.

Mr. BLACKBURN. That is a question of mathematical calculation. I doubt very much whether the Senator from Massachusetts knows anything more about that than I do, for I doubt if he ever owned a national bond in his life.

Mr. HOAR. Most of these questions are matters of mathematical calculation.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I doubt whether the Senator is prepared to say that he ever indulged himself on this line. I am frank to say I have not, because I do not believe either he or I belong to the bondholding class of the American people.

This is all I care to say, except if it should be asserted that opposition to this bill puts one in the position of objecting to State, county, and municipal securities being put upon even terms with national securities, I answer and say that the only objection that I have to doing that is not because I am afraid that the security in the nature of collateral would not be as good as national bonds. I have every faith in the solvency of our State, our county, and our municipal governments.

The only objection I have is, not because I do not want to dignify those local securities in the same way that the existing law does the bonds of the Government, but because it enlarges to still greater extent the power of the moneyed element, the banking people of the country, to contract or expand, not the amount of money issued, but what is practically the same thing, the amount of money in circulation at any one time.

But I have an objection beyond that to this bill, and that is that you bring in the syndicated railroads of the United States and say that every bond of every railroad which for ten years preceding has paid a dividend of as much as 4 per cent shall be accepted on even terms with the bonds of the nation itself. I should like for my mathematical friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, to tell me, if he can, how much margin would that give to the circulating medium of this country. How many railroad bonds are there in this country, the roads issuing which have paid for ten years a dividend of 4 per cent, and whose first-mortgage bonds, under the provisions of this proposed law, would stand on even terms as acceptable collateral for the idle money in the vaults of the Treasury? I do not know. I assume that it is no small amount.

I presume that it puts into the power of one man—I mean Pierpont Morgan, of New York, the promoter of pretty much all the railroad syndicates and mergers and combines and railroad monopolies of this land—I presume, I assume in the absence of contradiction, that it would put into the hands of that one man a power to be counted only in hundreds of millions of money. I assume in the absence of contradiction that Mr. Pierpont Morgan could to-morrow place as collateral in the subtreasuries of the United States at least five hundred millions, if not a thousand millions, of railroad bonds such as are described and set out in the provisions of this proposed act.

Mr. STEWART. If it will not disturb the Senator, I should like to ask him a question?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Would the Senator buy in the bonds issued during Cleveland's Administration—some sixty-two millions for 44, and a hundred million for 11 per cent premium—which, I understand, are now selling for about 35 per cent premium? They were sold to get money because of a deficiency in the Treasury. They are now selling, as I understand, at about 35 per cent premium. Would he buy them in at that price?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. STEWART. All right.

Mr. BLACKBURN. And I will tell him yes. Whether as an individual or as a representative of this nation I would, as an honest man, employ the last dollar of money, idle cash for which I had no use, in retiring my own debts; and those evidences of my debt are worth as much to me, as an honest man, as they are worth to the brokers in Wall street or anywhere else in the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Is the Senator sure that a declaration of such a policy—that he would buy them at any price if he were Secretary of the Treasury—would not push up the bonds to two or three hundred?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will answer the Senator, and I hope he

will be content with it, because it is the honest expression of the only opinion I have upon the subject. I say that to an honest man or to an honest nation the evidence of his or its debt ought never be worth more to anybody on earth than it is to him or to that nation.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose the Senator owed \$10,000—

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would pay it if I had the money.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose it was not due for six months?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would pay it before it was due if I had the money.

Mr. STEWART. Suppose the creditor asked you \$20,000 for it, would you pay him \$20,000 for it?

Mr. BLACKBURN. If I owed the Senator from Nevada \$10,000 and was paying him 4 per cent interest on it, I would never go and loan \$10,000 to somebody else at 1½ per cent and let the other debt run against me.

Mr. STEWART. Would you pay me \$20,000 to take up the obligation?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I would pay whatever it was worth to the world, and the debt of an honest man is worth more to him than it is to a speculator or a jobber.

Mr. President, if the railroad feature were eliminated from the bill I will frankly confess that one of my principal objections to the measure, though not the most serious or the most sweeping, would be obviated, for I do protest against giving into the hands of the railroad syndicates of the country an equal opportunity for the handling of Government money as if it were upon the basis of national bonds.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BLACKBURN. With great pleasure.

Mr. DEPEW. Will the Senator yield to me, not for a question, but for a mere statement as to these railroad bonds?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Certainly.

Mr. DEPEW. The bill says:

On the first-mortgage bonds of any railroad company, not including street-railway bonds, which has paid dividends of not less than 4 per cent per annum regularly and continuously on its entire capital stock for a period of not less than ten years previous to the deposit of the bonds.

There is not a railway company in the United States which has paid dividends upon its stock in that manner which has for sale any railroad bonds that are first-mortgage bonds.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Would it be necessary that they should be for sale in order to answer every purpose of collateral?

Mr. DEPEW. They do not have the bonds. The bonds are in the hands of the public. They have been sold years before. They have long periods to run. They belong to the public, and the railways have no interest in them and no control over them, except to pay the interest on them as it comes due or the principal when it comes due.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I thank the Senator, and I recognize him as an authority upon questions of railroad interest and all railroad concerns.

I put this question to the other side of the Chamber: Assuming that the Senator from New York is correct in the statement that there is not a solitary railroad on this continent that is to become the beneficiary of that provision of this bill, why is it there? How came it to find its way? Did it commit burglary and break into this bill? The Senator from New York tells us, and states it positively and I doubt not correctly, that there is not a railroad in the United States that will or can become a beneficiary of this provision of the bill. Then why put it there and why keep it there?

Mr. ALDRICH. I will answer the Senator very frankly. It was put there because the committee recognized the fact that railroad bonds of this class, subject to these conditions, are absolutely first-class security, as good as any bond can be, whether issued by the Government of the United States or by any municipality.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am not impeaching the value of the collateral.

Mr. HOAR. None of these companies will be beneficiaries of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Of course not.

Mr. HOAR. The beneficiaries are the national banks.

Mr. ALDRICH. These bonds have been sold by the railroad companies long years ago. There are no—

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am not talking about the railroad companies. I am talking about the fellow who holds the bonds.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator was trying to say that if this bill were passed it would be of benefit to railroad syndicates.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ALDRICH. And he mentioned the name of a single gentleman.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will mention his name again.

Mr. ALDRICH. Those companies have none of these bonds.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. ALDRICH. They have long since been sold by the railroad companies or disposed of by them and are now in the hands of investors throughout the country.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Widows and orphans and trust funds, I doubt not.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Let me ask the Senator a question. Do I understand the Senator from New York to say or do I understand the Senator from Rhode Island to say that if this bill becomes a law Mr. Morgan, as the head of great railroad enterprises, would not find himself in possession of collaterals upon which he might not draw a portion if not all of the surplus moneys from the Treasury?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Morgan, like anybody else, if he represented a national bank, could go out upon the market—

Mr. BLACKBURN. Has he got any now?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know whether Mr. Morgan has any now.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Neither do I, but I suspect it. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. My judgment is there is not a single railroad represented in Mr. Morgan's office at this moment which can possibly comply with the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Then I come back to the original proposition. I am standing on the statement made by the Senator from New York, and I know there is no better authority in this Chamber. If, in the light of that statement, there is not a railroad within the limits of our country that can profit by or become the beneficiary of that clause and section of the bill, why put it there, and why not strike it out and let us be rid of that one ugly feature at least?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky permit me?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee were anxious to restrict the securities to be deposited for the security of the United States deposits to certain well-known and definite securities that can find a market and do find a market anywhere in the United States. The Senator from Kentucky can not be unaware of the fact that a railroad bond of this description is absolute security and would be considered so in any moneyed institution in the United States.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I have conceded that.

Mr. ALDRICH. Or in the world.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I have conceded it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee were well aware that the amount of securities that could be used under this provision was very limited. The number of railroads in the United States that answer this description is very small. So the security is ample and is absolute. That is the reason why the provision was put in.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, as to the character of the security, I beg the Senate to bear me out in this, that I have never impeached the character of the collateral, whether it was to be a State bond or a county bond or a municipal bond or a railroad bond. I never have uttered one word in the direction of expressing a doubt as to the absolute value and safety of that collateral.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BLACKBURN. I never have done that.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will excuse me for one moment, I think he is making a mistake in saying that municipalities and States and railroad companies are to be the beneficiaries of the bill.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I know.

Mr. ALDRICH. Their securities are issued and outstanding.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Then I will not say—

Mr. ALDRICH. They are in the hands of investors throughout the United States.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will not say—

Mr. ALDRICH. And no railroad or municipality can possibly deposit the bonds—

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. Or get any advantage whatever. They must become the property of banks.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I admit it all. That does not touch or approach the question I have tried to discuss. What matters it to me whether the railroad or the State or the county or the municipal government owns the bonds? I do not care.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky a question?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Did he not ask just now why the railroad was inserted in the bill as a beneficiary?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes; and I am still asking that question, and I never yet have been able to get an answer.

Mr. HOAR. Now, then, he has asked that question. I ask him, is the railroad inserted in the bill as a beneficiary?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I did not start out to split hairs, but if nothing else will please the Senator from Massachusetts, I will undertake to do that.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will pardon me.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will answer his question and admit that it was a technical misstatement if I spoke of the railroad or the county or the State or the municipality as a beneficiary of the bill. What I mean to say is what the language of the bill says—that the person or persons, the individual or the corporation, anything or anybody—

Mr. ALDRICH. The bank.

Mr. BLACKBURN. The bank or what not.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not "the what not."

Mr. HOAR. Nobody else than the bank.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If they take their bonds and put them into the hands of a banker, the banker has a right, based on railroad bonds, State bonds, county bonds, or municipal bonds, to go and get possession of this currency at 1½ per cent. That is a quibble. It is worse than a quibble. What boots it to me, what do I care who gets the advantage, whether it be the corporation or the bank or the railroad? I say that if these railroad bonds are not to be dignified in this way without regard to their ownership, why put them in this bill? If this dangerous power is not to be conferred, why not strike it from the bill? The Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] says there are no such bonds to be deposited. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] says there are not many of them.

Mr. ALDRICH. Dangerous to whom?

Mr. BLACKBURN. To the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. In what way?

Mr. BLACKBURN. In that their money is being loaned at 1½ per cent whilst they are paying 4 per cent upon their indebtedness, which will not be retired.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can not be unaware of the fact, I assume, that the United States Government is paying on a large part of its debt—

Mr. BLACKBURN. Three per cent.

Mr. KEAN. Two per cent.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Not as low as 2 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not as low as 2 per cent?

Mr. BLACKBURN. No.

Mr. ALDRICH. I can not discuss this question with the Senator from Kentucky if he does not understand that.

Mr. BLACKBURN. This is no place to discuss it. The proposition has been made, and it has not been denied, and I defy the man who lives to deny it, that this bill proposes to loan the idle capital, for which the Government has no use, at a less per cent than the Government is paying upon the lowest interest-bearing bonds it has out.

Mr. ALDRICH. This bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall fix the rate of interest to be paid by the banks, but not less than 1½ per cent per annum. It is to be at a rate of not less than 1½ per cent.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes. Does the Senator think we will get more?

Mr. ALDRICH. And the bonds of the United States or a large portion of them, and all of them if the refunding act had gone on, are paying 2 per cent. The Senator ought to know that; and they are selling in the market at a rate of about 1½ per cent and some of them are yielding even less than that. You can not go and buy them. The Secretary—

Mr. BLACKBURN. The Senator is not going to involve me in the discussion of a complicated question—

Mr. ALDRICH. I am stating a few facts.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Which involve facts that I know as well as the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am stating a few facts which I desire to interject into the speech of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes; I am always glad to have the Senator from Rhode Island make any part of my speech he wants, for it only brings out in more glaring colors the injustice and the indefensibility of the exactions he is demanding.

The Senator may hope to involve me in a discussion as to what is the rate of tariff duty upon any one of a thousand articles, after he has manipulated that tariff schedule and complicated it with ad valorem and specific duties until even my mathematical friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, would find himself unable to decide it. I am not going into a discussion of the interest on bonds. There is to be considered the interest stipulated for and the premiums paid. I am not going into that.

I stand upon the proposition here asserted and not denied (and I have again and again challenged the Senator to deny it, and he has not done it, and I undertake to say he will not do it, because he can not do it) that the purpose of this bill is to loan the money of the American people, wrung out of the pockets of the taxpayers by a system of taxation conceded to be too high, which

the party in power refuse to reduce and say they will stand pat and refuse even to revise a single schedule—the purpose is to take this tax-wrung money that belongs to the American people, the producing classes, and loan it to somebody at a rate of interest below the lowest rate of interest that the Government is paying on any bond that it has on earth.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator know of a business man or a concern of any importance anywhere that does not, even if it borrows money, keep a deposit somewhere in a bank for which it receives no interest whatever or small interest, much less than it pays on its debts? Is not that the universal practice of all sound business concerns which must have money on hand which it can use at call?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I tried to say some time ago that I am not a banker or an expert in finance. But I will answer the Senator from Massachusetts by saying that I understand that a man who owes \$10,000 is not in the habit of depositing \$10,000 in a bank and drawing no interest on it in order that he may have the privilege of paying interest upon the debt.

Mr. HOAR. Now—

Mr. BLACKBURN. I ask the Senator to make his speech in his own time.

Mr. HOAR. I do not want to make a speech.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am trying to answer his question, but he will not let me. I beg the Senator's permission to answer his question.

It may be that an honest man, who owes a debt of \$10,000, will keep to his credit \$50 or \$100 in a bank, where it draws no interest, for an exigency that he may be called upon to meet. But I repeat, not for the first or for the second time, that I have but little respect for the business acumen and the personal integrity and honesty of that man who will lay aside surplus revenues, running up into the millions and hundreds of millions, while he has an unpaid debt out which it is in his power to dispose of and retire.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield for a simple question for information?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know that in my State provision is made by law for loaning the surplus money of the State, and it is loaned at a much lower rate of interest than the State bonds draw which are outstanding.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I should say that is bad finance.

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. I know that is also true of counties, and it is true of several of the States. I desire to ask the Senator if, in the laws of Kentucky, provision is not made whereby the treasurer of the State can loan a certain sum, under certain conditions, being part of the money of the State of Kentucky, to the banks of that State?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I will answer the Senator's question and tell him we do not need any law of that sort. My State, unlike his, does not owe anything.

Mr. McCUMBER. Do they make their deposits in that way?

Mr. BLACKBURN. No, sir. We loan our money at the best rate of interest the bank will pay us. But we are not paying any interest upon any debt, because we do not owe anything.

Mr. McCUMBER. But you are loaning out the State money.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I want to see the Federal Government in the same fix the State of Kentucky is—out of debt and loaning money, or else, reducing taxes and cease gouging people under the guise—

Mr. McCUMBER. Are you not, then, under your own proposition, in your State levying a tax for money which you loan again to the people?

Mr. BLACKBURN. No.

Mr. McCUMBER. Is it not exactly the same proposition you are complaining of here?

Mr. BLACKBURN. No. I will answer the Senator and say no, because the surplus we have is never more than what a private citizen would have to his credit in his bank if he had a hundred dollars and owed ten thousand. We have no surplus revenue.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is what I would say also of the United States, considering our financial importance.

Mr. BLACKBURN. All our surplus revenues go into the school fund; and I would say to the Senator from North Dakota that he had better adopt the policy I am insisting upon this nation adopting, and which the people of the State of Kentucky have adopted—get out of debt and quit paying interest and quit taxing the people unnecessarily.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is—

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am through with all I have to say about this bill, and I will yield the floor to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. All right.

Mr. BLACKBURN. All I want to say further about this bill is that I think it is a bad one, and I am going to try to help make it better by an amendment. I know I can not offer it now, for it is not in order, as there are several amendments pending ahead of mine. But I am going to try honestly to improve the general texture of this bill, and as soon as these amendments are disposed of I intend to offer one for that purpose, which is to put upon it what is known as the Republican, House-indorsed, Senate-committee-indorsed, Littlefield, Roosevelt antitrust bill, and I think that will cure many of the defects of the bill.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, before the Senator from Kentucky leaves, and before another speech intervenes, I was very much pleased, as an admirer of the State of Kentucky, at the ideal conditions of her debt and credit as stated by the distinguished Senator; and so he was enabled to answer the Senator from North Dakota satisfactorily upon the question which he has been so ably arguing.

But I find here that the city of Covington, Ky., has a debt of \$2,061,200, and that the city of Louisville, Ky., has a debt of \$8,657,000. Those two cities collect large amounts of money from taxation for which they have no use, except as it comes due during the year. Do they use that money to pay these debts, or leave it in banks without interest?

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from New York could have understood me as saying that there was not a county or a municipality in the State of Kentucky that owed a debt. I surely was not capable of a statement like that. I spoke of the State in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota. He was telling about the financial policy of his State and I answered as to the policy of the State of Kentucky.

In order to be exactly correct, I should have said that Kentucky has a debt too. Of course the municipalities in Kentucky owe a debt. Of course the counties, for there are 119 of them in the State, owe debts. Their credit is very good, and I do not think any of their bonds are selling below par. I said the State of Kentucky owed no debt. In order to be technically correct, for that was substantially correct, I should have said that we have a debt, and a perpetual debt; that we had made it so intentionally. But that is the school fund, which we have taken care of in that shape. That is what I said.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator who has this bill in charge whether he has stricken out of the bill the provision about first-mortgage bonds of railroads?

Mr. ALDRICH. That has not been done. There has been no motion or suggestion of that kind made yet.

Mr. TELLER. I understood that somebody made the motion and that the Senator had accepted it.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Colorado probably was misled by me in what I had to say. I stated that it had been done, because I understood it was agreed to. If that motion has not been made, it will be made.

Mr. TELLER. I think that before discussing the bill it had better be determined whether the friends of the bill are willing to strike out that provision or not. It seems to be very objectionable to certain Senators.

Mr. President, I have examined this bill with some care. I have tried pretty hard to bring myself to vote for it, because I can see some advantages in the bill and some disadvantages in the present system. But I do not believe it is just what we ought to have had and what we are entitled to have from the party in control of the Senate. I think we should have had a measure more fitted to the present conditions.

This is an enlargement of section 5153 of the Revised Statutes. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the peculiar language of that section. It provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall require the depositaries thus designated "to give satisfactory security" by a deposit of United States bonds and other bonds "for the safe-keeping and prompt payment of the public money so deposited with them," etc.

Mr. President, that has been construed by some to mean that in addition to the bonds the Secretary might call for other securities. It has been held by the present Secretary of the Treasury that that authorized him to take other securities, and that I understand he has done. If that is the interpretation of this law there will be some merit in the bill which provides what securities he shall take. As it is now he is without restriction; he can take any security that he thinks best.

I have found no difficulty with this bill on the ground that the security to be taken was not ample, whether it be railroad bonds or whatever it may be. I have no particular prejudice against railroad bonds and railroad stock. Railroad bonds and railroad

stock are supposed to be held by the citizens of this country, and if it should increase, as it undoubtedly will increase, the value of their bonds and of every description of bond that can be used for this purpose, I do not think that that is an objection to the bill. It will have a tendency, undoubtedly, to decrease to some extent the value of the national securities, which are now so high that I do not see how the Government could buy them with any considerable profit. If they were liable to go below par I should regard that as a very objectionable feature of this bill. Everybody knows that though you may take other securities it will not depreciate national bonds to the extent of their going below par. So there is no evil in that.

Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that the Government ought to pay its debts. I have contended for that in the Senate from time to time. On every measure for the issue of a bond that has been voted for in the Senate since I have been in it I have insisted that the Government should reserve to itself the right to call that bond for payment whenever it had the money to pay.

But we are not in that condition to-day, I am sorry to say, because that policy has not been the policy of the party in power. On the contrary, the policy of the party in power, for the last few years at least, has been to perpetuate, and I do not know but I ought to say increase, but I will not say that, because it is not necessary to this debate—it has been the policy of the party in power to perpetuate the public debt. That has been done sometimes upon the theory that the present banking system is dependent on the Government bonds.

Mr. President, I do not share with the Senator from Kentucky his opposition to national banks. I think the national banking system is the best system we ever had, and I am very much afraid, from the character of the legislation proposed in modern times, that it is the very best we are ever to have. It is certainly better than anything which has been suggested by the bills that we hear of in another place, and sometimes here, for a banking system that is said to be elastic; in other words, under which somebody can issue notes and make currency of them whenever somebody sees fit. Mr. President, you can not have an elastic currency in the sense that term is used and have a safe currency. You are quite likely to sacrifice safety whenever you secure this so-called elasticity.

I am one of those who do not believe in allowing banks, except it might be under restriction which should be most carefully prepared, to have what is called an asset issue. I am not going into that to-night, but I want to call attention to the time of payment of our national bonds. In 1900 we issued bonds payable with 2 per cent interest after April 1, 1930. I know what was said when that was done: "You must issue a bond with a low rate of interest, and to do that you must have a long time bond," and we made a 2 per cent bond and sold it at par, which our friends on the other side of the Chamber thought was the greatest financial triumph of the world. They appealed to us, I know, and said: "We are about to issue a bond of 2 per cent; did anybody in the world ever do the like of that?"

Now, Mr. President, I said then, I remember, and I want to say now, to have paid a greater amount of interest would have been more to the interest of the Government if we had reserved the right to call those bonds before maturity on fair terms.

We have to-day in the Treasury of the United States four hundred and some odd million dollars. I have the statement right here and I will give it as it is stated. We have, according to the statement made February 1 by the Government, \$300,820,275 in the Treasury; and I find here a note:

This statement of money held in the Treasury as assets of the Government does not include deposits of public money in national bank depositaries to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States and amounting to \$142,903,773.07.

So, Mr. President, if you put those items together you have \$443,724,048 in the Treasury, because that in the banks is practically in the Treasury, and that amount of money could be paid upon our national debt if the Government had reserved the right to do so.

Then we have some bonds that are due in 1903, some in 1907, some in 1925, and a small amount in 1904. So we are locked up, and I do not believe you can use this money for that purpose.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator make the statement about what money we have in the Treasury once more?

Mr. TELLER. I will, for the benefit of the Senator and those who are not paying attention.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I heard it; I thought I did.

Mr. TELLER. The Treasury statement which I hold, of February 1, 1903, says:

Held in Treasury as assets of the Government, \$300,820,275.

Then I find a note at the bottom:

This statement of money held in the Treasury as assets of the Government does not include deposits of public money in national bank depositaries, to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, and amounting to \$142,903,773.07.

Now, putting those two sums together you have \$443,820,275.

I can show without any difficulty that we might increase the amount we have in the Treasury by about \$14,000,000 for the redemption of bank notes that could be used and is used sometimes for the purposes of the Government. Of course, if the Government uses it, the Government must replace it, as it is required for such redemption. Also you have \$20,000,000 worth of silver on hand that might have been put into money long ago if the Government had so wished.

So we have here in the neighborhood of \$477,000,000 which we can use, and of that money only \$143,000,000, in round numbers, is in circulation, because it is in the banks of the country.

Now, Mr. President, I am one of those who thought with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] that we should collect only as much money as is needed for the current expenses of the Government. We collected this surplus some years ago. We have held it in the public Treasury for some time. But I ought to say that in this \$473,000,000 there are one hundred and fifty millions of gold held in the Treasury for the purpose of redeeming greenbacks and Treasury notes, although Treasury notes were not until recently to be redeemed in gold. However, that is a small amount.

The total of that—I speak from recollection, I have not got it here—is a little over 300,000,000; 346,000,000 greenbacks, and I think about 20,000,000, or something like that, of Treasury notes, but of the 346,000,000 probably there is not over 300,000,000 in circulation. So, to redeem about \$300,000,000 or a little over, we hold in the Treasury \$150,000,000 in gold, and that amount has been so held for three years.

I remember when that provision was made that it was pretty thoroughly contested on this side of the Chamber. We said it was not necessary to lock up that amount of money. But on the other side it was said we must make the Government credit strong by locking up the money in the Treasury to that amount. Mr. President, I have never believed that it added a particle to the strength of this Government. There was not a man on this continent who did not know that we were receiving every day money enough out of the current receipts of the Government to have redeemed every greenback that should be presented.

In the three years we have been locking up those \$150,000,000 away from the public, who have a right to use it, we have redeemed \$68,000,000, in round numbers, of greenbacks and Treasury notes, or about \$22,000,000 a year.

What is that law, Mr. President? If to-day the Treasury Department redeems \$10,000, to-morrow it must put back the \$10,000, and if they can not do it by exchange of greenbacks so reissued for gold they must go out and borrow the money, for there is a provision of that kind. They must put it back if there is enough money in the Treasury to put it back, and of course there always is. So that if you take out to-day \$10,000, \$15,000, or \$20,000, to-morrow it is back again.

We keep \$150,000,000 of gold in the Treasury. Have we got so much money that we do not need this large amount in circulation? Last summer when a great financier was called to the head of the Treasury Department from the West he came down from Iowa, and he knew when he got down here, if he did not know it before, that to a very great extent, under the modern system of doing business, the credit and the business interests of the country are dependent upon what the Government is going to do or what the Government will do in an emergency, and he said at once, "There is not money enough in circulation."

I think he was backed by the great financiers of the great financial centers of this country in the opinion that there was not. The first thing he did was to say to the banks of the country, "You must issue more bank notes; we need now \$16,000,000 additional currency, and you must issue it at once;" and the banks, having a proper respect for the Secretary of the Treasury and feeling the need of more circulation, proceeded to issue \$16,000,000 of bank notes. If he had had the authority, he could have taken \$50,000,000 out of the gold reserve and not disturbed the Treasury at all.

He could have taken \$145,000,000 out and not disturbed the business of the country an iota nor impaired the credit of the Government in the slightest degree. The five millions left would have been ample for redemption purposes, with his right to replenish that fund.

Now, Mr. President, this bill is a partial relief, but we are entitled to something better than this bill. We are entitled to something that shall release not only the money that is in the Treasury called the current funds, but that great big treasure of \$150,000,000 that is there for no more useful purpose than if it was in the sea. The Secretary can make all needful redemption without it and it is not needed to strengthen the credit of the Government.

Will any man in this Chamber say that the Government of the United States needs to pile up in its Treasury \$150,000,000 to convince the people that when I go to the Treasury with a Treasury

note or with a greenback I can get the gold on it if I want it? Mr. President, there is at all times there unused an abundance of gold in the Treasury independent of this reserve fund. The bill is defective because it does not deal with that question.

There has been much criticism of the deposit of this money in the national banks by the Treasury Department. That is not the fault of the Secretary of the Treasury. It is the fault of the condition that we have created by law. It is because the Government can not use this money to pay its debts, and therefore it must use it in some way that it may get into the circulation of the country, or else it must keep it locked up there to the detriment of the business interests of the country.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I wish to ask the Senator if he thinks we could keep bonds at par with an option reserved to the Government to pay the bonds at the will of the Government?

Mr. TELLER. You could have reserved the right to call the bonds on some terms. I do not say that you would not have to give some premium, but you might have provided what that should be. We could to-day take this money out of the Treasury and pay it on our debt if we had reserved that right, and we ought at all times to be in such a condition that when we owe a debt if we wish to pay it we can pay it, either with a premium or without, which premium should be fixed when the bond is created.

Mr. SPOONER. Two per cent was considered at the time a very low rate of interest.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, Mr. President, I am frank enough to say that if the Government had reserved the right to call these bonds in a short time it would not have been able to have sold them at 2 per cent; but it would have been better for us to have provided that we might call those bonds and as to what sort of a premium and under what conditions at the time we issued the bonds than to have waited twenty-five or thirty years to pay them.

Mr. President, this bill is more dangerous for what may be done under it than for what is actually in it. The Secretary of the Treasury has the right to select the banks in which he will put this money. I do not mean to say there has been any favoritism in putting money into banks; that is a matter that I do not care now to discuss; but I do say that it would be a most remarkable thing, with this large amount of money to be deposited in banks, if there were no favoritism. That would be just as true if one party were in power as if the other were in power. I am not making complaint that the party at present in power would be any more liable to show favoritism than any other party.

It is almost impossible for the Secretary of the Treasury not to have a preference for the class of men with whom he comes in contact and whom he regards as most friendly to him and to the Administration under which he is holding office. We do know, for we have had the statement made here on the floor, that the predecessor of the present Secretary was appealed to by a gentleman in New York to make a large deposit of Government money in the bank over which he presided, on the ground that his bank and its directors had contributed liberally to the campaign fund of the party then in power. I need not mention the name of the bank nor the name of the bank officer, but everybody here, I think, will remember the circumstance.

Mr. President, I have never had but one application since I have been in the Senate from a bank in Colorado to have Government money deposited with the bank. I do not know what were the political opinions of those bankers, and they did not express them. I sent their note to the Secretary of the Treasury, stating that they were reputable people and that I understood the bank stood well. The Secretary then sent some money there. That is the only Government money that I have any personal knowledge of ever having been placed in a bank in Colorado.

I do not think Colorado has any special interest in this matter. It may be that other banks have had Government money lent them; but, if so, I am not aware of it.

Here is \$143,000,000. Now, when this bill is enacted into law and these securities are taken, there will be more than that amount, and it is a question whether it would not be better to have this money put into national banks with proper security than it would be to keep it locked up in the Treasury. Of the two methods I believe it would be better to put it in circulation. When I say that, I do not mean to say that I approve of this bill. What I object to is the lack of what is not in the bill more than to what is in it. The vice of this bill is what has not been placed in it more than in what has been put in it.

But, Mr. President, suppose the Secretary of the Treasury should conclude to show favoritism and put the money all in New York or some other one place. I should hardly imagine that he would put it all in one place; but suppose he should put a larger amount

in one section of the country than in another, would it not eventually breed complaints? Is it not possible in enacting a law of this kind to put some regulation upon the Secretary of the Treasury?

I tried to do that in committee, as some members of the committee will recollect, but failed to satisfy the committee, and I am free to say I could not satisfy myself as to exactly what ought to be done to put a proper restriction on the Secretary of the Treasury; yet I believe it can be done, and it ought to be done, and if we were in the beginning of the session I have no doubt we would be able to do it.

Mr. SPOONER. I was going to ask the Senator if he does not think that by enlarging the security, which confessedly is good and safe under the provisions of this bill, there is much less liability for the charge of favoritism and a much wider scope in the distribution of money throughout the country than there is now, when it is limited to national bonds?

Mr. TELLER. I am inclined to think that the Senator is right about that.

Mr. SPOONER. There are banks all over the United States which can not, through correspondents or otherwise, obtain national bonds, but they can obtain county bonds, State bonds, and city bonds, and if such bonds are made securities, I have thought—and that is one thing which commended this bill to me somewhat—that it would lead to a larger distribution of money throughout the country.

Mr. TELLER. I think that is one feature which in some measure reconciles me to the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Has the Senator's attention been called to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, which is now pending?

Mr. TELLER. I understood there was some proposition pending, but I do not know what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is understood at the desk that that amendment was accepted by the Senator from Rhode Island, and agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I did agree to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And it is a part of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes. I should like to have that provision read.

Mr. TELLER. Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 1 the following provision was inserted:

That, as far as practicable, the Secretary of the Treasury shall fairly distribute the deposits herein authorized throughout the country.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, that will at least indicate what is the legislative mind on the subject, although it seems to me that any man who was fit to be Secretary of the Treasury would do that without any provision of law. It will not entirely cure the evil of which I am complaining, but it may minimize it somewhat.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, one element which gives value to the Government bonds and which has led to their appreciation in price is that whenever the Secretary of the Treasury gives a notice of his desire to purchase them the bankers buy them at a premium through their correspondents in order to send them in as a basis of security for their circulation.

Mr. TELLER. Yes, Mr. President, I understand that has been the case. I think it will enable the Government, if it sees fit to call in these bonds—I mean to become purchasers of them—to secure them at a fairer rate than it can now. If I could see any such disposition on the part of the Administration to pay off these bonds by buying them, I should feel very much better about this bill, but I see nothing of the kind. I hear of no proposition to reduce the bonded debt.

Mr. SPOONER. If my friend from Colorado will allow me, I think he will agree that in almost every instance in late years where the Secretary of the Treasury, having money on hand with which to buy bonds, has sought to put out that money in order to relieve the money stringency, the price of bonds was put up so rapidly that he had to cease purchasing them.

Mr. TELLER. I think that is true, and great evil has been inflicted upon the country because no provision was made for buying bonds before due if the Government had the money to buy them.

Mr. President, I want to say a word as to what I think is one of the dangers of this bill, and then I am going to content myself with voting against it. I am of the opinion that the passage of the bill may afford some relief, but it is not the full relief that we ought to have. If we were in the beginning of the session I should insist that this bill should not be voted on until some further effort was made to bring it up to what I think is required.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me, I want to ask him a question. Do I understand the Senator to mean by that that the bill should go further and repeal any part of the redemption act, and thereby lessen the redemption fund in the Treasury?

Mr. TELLER. I think, Mr. President, that at least \$140,000,000 ought to be taken out of the Treasury and put into circulation. We know, and everybody knows, that while the circulation has increased the business activity of this country has increased much faster than the circulation. That is why the Secretary of the Treasury came here last summer and said that more currency was required. He said he was afraid of a panic. I do not suppose there is anybody who would disagree with me if I should say that if the Government were to withdraw that \$143,000,000 from the banks and put it in the Treasury there would be a panic. If the proposition were made to take \$50,000,000 of it, put it in the Treasury, and lock it up, there would be a panic not only in the city of New York, but in all the great financial centers of this country.

Mr. President, is the system a good one which puts in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury the power to discriminate in favor of one class of banks, which may be controlled by his political adherents, as against those which may be controlled by those whom he may regard as his political opponents? Is it a good system which enables the Secretary of the Treasury to say that Eastern securities shall be favored above Western securities, and that he will put these deposits all east of the Alleghenies or west of the Alleghenies, if he happens to think that better?

Should there not be some method by which, in proportion to their wealth and their ability to pay, if the people of one section wanted the use of money, that they should not be crowded out by reason of favoritism to another section? Should there not be in this case some restriction as to how much should be deposited in one bank? Should there not be some restriction upon the way that this money should be called from the banks? If the Government can not call this money without danger to the public interest, ought there not to be some provision to regulate the manner in which it should be turned back into the Treasury by the banks? Should there not be some restrictions imposed upon them as on the Government?

Mr. President, I saw to-day a letter written by bankers to a member of this body, in which they declared that if this bill shall pass the item of interest alone would require the banks who could not make money under it to send their money back to the Treasury in large quantities. If that is done under this bill, there will be a financial stringency, which will be taken advantage of in this country to bring on a general panic.

Mr. BURTON. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. Does the Senator not think that this requiring banks to pay interest on deposits is without the legitimate domain of banking? Ought Congress to encourage a policy of that kind?

Mr. TELLER. I understand what that provision was put in the bill for. That was put in by our friends who got up this bill because they knew there was a complaint on the part of the public against having, in round numbers, \$150,000,000—for it is practically that—of the people's money in the banks, which the banks are paying no interest upon and lending out to citizens of this country at rates of interest in some places at least very high. That was a sop thrown to the complainers by the ingenious draftsmen of this bill.

I had some years ago some connection as an attorney with a bank and a little as a bank president for a few years. I have contended always that no ordinary bank ever ought to pay a dollar of interest on its deposits. It should keep the money that is deposited there for the people; and when it has to pay interest on it it will loan it even if the loan is not the best. In such cases there is danger that the bank, in its anxiety to get back the interest that it has paid, will make improper loans.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado, while he is on that point, whether or not it is his construction of this bill, on page 3, lines 8 to 14, inclusive, that it is a mere loan of money on interest? It is called a deposit; but it is a loan of money, because it bears interest at a fixed rate. If that is so, I want to ask the Senator whether he has considered, or whether the Senator in charge of this bill or any other Senator has considered, in this connection, section 5489 of the Revised Statutes, which I will read. That section provides:

Sec. 5489. If the Treasurer of the United States, or any assistant treasurer, or any public depository, fails safely to keep all moneys deposited by any disbursing officer or disbursing agent, as well as all moneys deposited by any receiver, collector, or other person having moneys of the United States, he shall be deemed guilty of embezzlement of the moneys not so safely kept, and shall be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than ten years, and fined in a sum equal to the amount of money so embezzled.

That provision in regard to embezzlement would apply to the national banks if this bill should become a law.

Mr. TELLER. What section is that?

Mr. MORGAN. Section 5489 of the Revised Statutes. If that embezzlement section applies to the national banks that are

depositories, then this bill relieves them from the personal penalty of this section, by converting the deposits into loans. I fear that is the object of the bill.

Mr. TELLER. I presume if this bill passes it will be regarded as a repeal pro tanto of that section.

Mr. MORGAN. Then that ought to be so expressed, because we change the nature of the obligation from that of a Government depository to that of a loanee. The person who borrows money has the right to do with it as he pleases, but here is a personal penalty put upon every depository, and this bill proposes to relieve that depository from the obligations and penalties which this section of the Revised Statutes imposes.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, my attention had never been called to that point, and I do not care at this late hour to open up that question, because I only want to say a few words more, and then I shall yield the floor.

I was saying that I thought national banks ought not to pay interest. I was about to say that in a town with which I am somewhat familiar, where I go up and down the street occasionally, there is a bank which advertises that it pays 4 per cent interest. If I had a million dollars I would not put a dollar in that bank. More banks have been broken by their attempts to pay interest and thus to secure large deposits than by almost any other cause. Safety is what you want in a bank, and that is what we do want in this case.

We can excuse ourselves for putting money in a bank only upon one ground; that is, that we have no use to which we can properly put the money. If that is the intention with which you deposit money in a bank, then you may put it there without any interest, to show to the public you put it there because it is to their interest that you shall put it there instead of locking it up, and because there is no other way of getting it out to the public. What are you going to say about this \$150,000,000 which you lock up?

Are you going to tell the people of the United States that you do that because somebody has doubts of the credit of this Government of ours, that paid a bigger debt in less time than any nation in the history of the world ever paid, and is better able to-day to pay its debt dollar for dollar and on quick time, if it has the authority to do it, than any nation in the world?

It is true that the Government statement shows that we owe \$2,000,000,000, in round numbers. We owe a little more than \$1,500,000,000. The greenbacks we need not count, because the people are not calling for them, but if it was necessary to pay our bonds we could raise the money in a short time and pay them off without any distress to the people of the United States.

There was a time when I hoped to have lived to see the national debt paid. I have lived under the Government when it practically owed nothing, and I wanted to live long enough to see the great debt incurred by the efforts to keep these States together paid. I have seen the time under the auspices of the party now in power when I had reason to believe that hope would be realized. I have seen them paying it at a rate that no other Government had ever paid its debt, and that, too, without a burden upon the American people. But the system changed, and from a general anxiety to pay the public debt there became an anxiety to perpetuate the public debt.

I have had many and many a man say to me that we ought to increase the public debt. For what reason do you suppose that some of these men say we ought to do that? They tell us that the people who own the public debt will have a greater interest in this country than if they did not. If the time ever comes in this Republic when we shall have to make a debt to attach the people to the Government of the United States it will be time to abandon our present form of government. There is not any necessity for that now, and I trust there never will be. We ought to go on and pay the public debt as rapidly as possible.

When you get this money in the banks how are you going to get it out? If you get it out all at once, then you create a financial depression, or worse than that, perhaps, a financial revulsion of such a character that it will sweep millions and millions of values away.

When you put the money in the national banks, two or three hundred million dollars, as you will under this bill—for we are now raising a surplus of at least \$50,000,000 a year more than we can or ought to use, and that surplus will be greater in the next year than it was in this if prosperity continues in this country—when you have added two or three hundred millions, the very fact that these banks hold this money will prevent you from making any proper arrangement for putting this money to the use that the taxpayer has a right to demand you should put it, and that is to discharge the debts of this Government or to pay the current expenses thereof.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator agree at the next session of Congress to cooperate with the majority to reduce the revenues of the Government? I hope he will. We certainly shall make the effort, and I hope the Senator will be found cooperating with us in that direction.

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island speaks by authority of his party. So far as I know it is greatly disturbed on that question. One Senator tells us that you must "stand pat" and not do anything; another one of the financial organs of the Republican party said the other day that the tariff did need some revision, but he said it needs revising upward, and not downward.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was talking about the question of the revenues of the Government, and not as to how they should be reduced.

Mr. TELLER. The revenue of the Government is derived in two ways. One is by internal taxes upon the people, and the other is by a tax upon imports, which of course I think, although I am a protectionist, we pay, and nobody else.

Mr. President, I will be happy to cooperate with the Senator from Rhode Island and all the Senators on the other side, as will everybody, I believe, on this side of the Chamber, in reducing the tariff schedules to a reasonable rate, and that, too, whether it is upon sugar or upon the manufactures of Rhode Island. But we will hardly be prepared, either then or now, to allow the reduction of the revenue to be made at the expense of the men who live on the farms in the West.

Mr. ALDRICH. I trust the Senator from Colorado and I will agree upon the methods of reduction. I am inclined to think we shall. I think he will agree with me that a reduction of the tariff, if effective, would increase the revenue rather than reduce it. But that, of course, is a question which is not here now and is not a practical one. I have no doubt, however, the Senator from Colorado and I will find ourselves in agreement upon that matter.

Mr. TELLER. I am not a free trader. I have not been since I left school. I was then.

My judgment is we can reduce the tariff and reduce the revenues and hold our markets. I am not going to admit that a reduction of tariff will bring excessive imports here to compete with the products of our people, because you have a tariff now, and you have had it since the McKinley tariff was adopted, that is higher than it ought to be.

Standing on this floor when the McKinley tariff was being discussed, I declared that it was not a Republican tariff; that it was way beyond the Republican idea as we understood it in the early days of the party, when the tariff was put on to protect the American laboring man and the American capitalist, to equalize conditions between the European laborer and the European capitalist and the American laborer and the American capitalist. The tariff ought to be revised; and if the friends of it will not revise it, then opponents of the tariff will.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me that I may present a conference report?

Mr. TELLER. I will.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 22, 33, 34, 35, 43, 49, 51, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 68, 70, 79, 86, 87, 89, 94, 96, 98, 99, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 117, 121, 122, 123, 124, 127, 128, 131, 134, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 158, 161, 163, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 180, 181, 182, 185, 190, and 191.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 12, 13, 14, 16, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 55, 57, 63, 66, 67, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 82, 85, 91, 100, 101, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120, 125, 126, 129, 130, 132, 133, 142, 156, 157, 159, 160, 162, 164, 165, 167, 177, 178, 179, 184, 187, 188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, and 205, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "two civil engineers or computers, at \$1,500 each;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "clerk, \$1,000; clerk, \$900;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$74,064;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "temporary clerk hire, \$500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$42,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$15,200;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$20,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "four;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$19,280;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$160,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$100,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$25,100;" and on page — of the bill, after the word "dollars," in line —, insert the following: "to be expended for paving Vermont avenue from R to T streets, New Hampshire avenue from V to W streets, and V street from Seventeenth to Eighteenth streets;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$15,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$20,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$29,900;" and on page 15 of the bill, in line 19, after the word "avenue," insert the words "except as herein specified;" and on page 15 of the bill, after line 23, insert as a separate paragraph the following: "Hereafter the Commissioners, in submitting the schedules of streets and avenues to be improved, shall each year arrange said streets and avenues in the order of their importance, as determined by them after personal examination of said streets and avenues;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "For Rhode Island avenue, Florida avenue toward First street, pave, \$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "\$5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$141,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$90,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$10,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$209,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said Senate amendment insert the following: "And during the fiscal years 1903 and 1904 the price prescribed by Congress for lighting each street lamp in the District of Columbia with gas or oil shall be construed to include the cost of the illuminating material used in lighting and extinguishing lamps, repairing, painting, cleaning, purchasing, and expense of erecting and maintaining lamp-posts, street designations, lanterns, and fixtures;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$28;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$80;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided further, That the amount for which a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such material and work as may be necessary for prosecuting the work on said slow sand filtration plant, and for each and every purpose connected therewith to final completion within the shortest practicable time, or within which the materials may be purchased and the work done otherwise than by contract, to be paid for as appro-

priations may from time to time be made by law, is hereby increased from \$2,768,405 to \$3,468,405;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$12,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$953,975;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$17,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 135, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "45;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$749,940;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 149, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$38,300;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$21,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$28,356;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$16,552;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 204, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 3. That until and including June 30, 1904, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to advance, on the requisition of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, made in the manner now prescribed by law, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary from time to time to meet the general expenses of said District as authorized by Congress, and reimburse the Treasury for the portion of said advances payable by the District of Columbia out of the taxes and revenues collected for the support of the government thereof: *Provided*, That all advances made under this act and under the acts of February 11, 1901, and June 1, 1902, not reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States on or before June 30, 1904, shall be reimbursed to said Treasury out of the revenues of the District of Columbia from time to time within five years beginning July 1, 1904, together with interest thereon at the rate of 2 per cent per annum until so reimbursed: *Provided further*, That interest on advances made prior to June 30, 1902, in the accounts of the District of Columbia with the United States shall be computed for the fiscal year 1903, and paid immediately after the close thereof from the revenues of the District of Columbia, and the same rule of computation and payment shall apply to all advances made for the fiscal year 1903 and subsequent fiscal years: *Provided further*, That the Auditor for the State and other Departments and the auditor of the District of Columbia shall file annually a report of the amounts of such advances, stating the amount for each fiscal year separately and also all reimbursements made under this section, together with the balances remaining, if any, due the United States: *And provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall be so construed as to require the United States to bear any part of the cost of street extensions and of advances heretofore or hereafter made for these purposes made by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be repaid in full from the revenues of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to same.

W. B. ALLISON,

M. S. QUAY,

F. M. COCKRELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES T. McCLEARY,

ELMER J. BURKETT,

MECENAS E. BENTON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 7, 13, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$34,165;" and the Senate agree to the same.

F. E. WARREN,

R. A. ALGER,

E. W. PETTUS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. T. HULL,

RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5437) to authorize the settlement of the accounts of officers in the Army.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16656) regulating the importation of breeding animals.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17046) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HEMENWAY, Mr. LITTAUER, and Mr. McRAE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

FORTIFICATION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17046) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. TILMAN were appointed.

ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to renew the request for unanimous consent that the Senate meet at 12 o'clock to-morrow morning, solely for the purpose of hearing eulogies upon deceased members of the House.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope there will be no objection to that.

Mr. DOLLIVER. What is the objection to the hour of 11 o'clock?

Mr. ALDRICH. None whatever, if that is more satisfactory.

Mr. DOLLIVER. There are four Representatives in whose memory services will be held.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will modify my request and make it 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent that to-night a recess be taken until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, in order that eulogies may be delivered on deceased members of the House. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. No other business to be transacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is the understanding that no other business will then be transacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; that no other business shall then be transacted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 2987) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Rittenhouse;

A bill (H. R. 3100) providing for the conveyance of Widows Island, Maine, to the State of Maine;

A bill (H. R. 7433) granting an increase of pension to Byron C. Knapp;

A bill (H. R. 7864) to pay John F. Lawson \$237.96, balance due him for services as United States mail carrier;

A bill (H. R. 8149) granting an increase of pension to James B. Martin;

A bill (H. R. 10175) granting a pension to Mary R. Bayly, formerly Mary S. Redick;

A bill (H. R. 15461) for the relief of Daniel F. Lee;

A bill (H. R. 15985) to confirm certain forest lieu selections made under the act approved June 4, 1897; and

A bill (H. R. 16888) to extend to the port of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement.

RESTORATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report by the architects, with accompanying pictures, regarding the work of repairing and refurbishing the White House and the erection of the Executive office building.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 1903.

ISLE OF PINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Relations with Cuba, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of February 18, 1903, requesting the President "if, in his judgment, the same be not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the Senate as to the present status of the Isle of Pines, and what Government is exercising authority and control in said island, what instructions, if any, regarding said island were given at the time when the military occupation of Cuba by the United States was terminated; and what action, if any, has been taken for the protection of the interests of citizens of the United States who have purchased property and settled in the Isle of Pines," I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of War.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 1903.

LAND HELD BY EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith reports by the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney-General, Postmaster-General, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries, in compliance with the following provision of the sundry civil bill approved June 28, 1902.

The President is hereby requested to cause to be prepared and submitted to Congress at the commencement of its next session a statement showing what lots or parcels of land, other than public lands held for settlement under the public-land laws, are owned by the United States and held by the several Executive Departments or other branches of the public service, the area of each, the purposes for which each is held or occupied, in what State, Territory, or country, and in or near what town or city each is located.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 1903.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12199) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate resume the consideration of the immigration bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada said to me that he had filed a notice under the rule adopted this morning (I do not know whether the Senator is in the Chamber) that he wished to be present when the bill was further considered. I hope he is in the Chamber, I will say, for I am quite willing that the consideration of the bill shall be proceeded with.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I must say I had no notice of that. The Senator from Nevada did not indicate any such desire to me, and he knew that for the time being the bill is in my charge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada left word at the desk with the clerks that he desired to be present when the bill was taken up.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, does that preclude taking up the bill upon motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent was given that the bill should be taken up.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I beg pardon. I did not hear the announcement by the Chair of unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate. It is in the Senate, and the pending amendment is, on page 3, line 19, to strike out the words which the Secretary will report.

The SECRETARY. After the word "prostitution," in line 19, page 3, section 2, it is proposed to strike out—
persons whose migration has been induced by offers, solicitations, promises, or agreements, parole or special, express or implied, of labor or work, or service of any kind, skilled or unskilled, in the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. The word "and" should be added, and a semicolon.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Following "the United States?"

Mr. GALLINGER. Following "the United States." That should be included in the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACON and Mr. FAIRBANKS addressed the Chair.

Mr. BACON. I will not interfere if the Senator from Indiana has an amendment to offer.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. On behalf of the committee, I send to the desk certain amendments, which I ask to have considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Section 23, page 19, line 24, after the word "charges," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the Commissioner-General of Immigration may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, whenever in his judgment such action may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act, detail immigration officers for temporary service in foreign countries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 18, page 15, line 18, after the word "Treasury," it is proposed to insert:

The United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service shall be reimbursed by the immigration service for all expenditures incurred in carrying out the medical inspection of aliens under regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. ELKINS. Will the Senator from Indiana explain the amendment?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It explains itself.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not understand it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Then I will present a letter from the Treasury Department to the chairman of the committee that explains it fully. I ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE,
Washington, February 23, 1903.

Hon. BOIES PENROSE,
Chairman Committee on Immigration, United States Senate.

SIR: Referring to H. R. 12199 and to the amendment providing that the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service shall be reimbursed by the Immigration Service for expenditures in carrying out the medical inspection of aliens, etc., I have to state that by law the medical inspection of immigrants is imposed upon this service, requiring the detail of officers for this purpose; that there are 9 medical officers at Ellis Island, N. Y., detailed for this work exclusively; also 1 stationed in Canada, and 4 officers stationed, for like work exclusively, at four other ports in the United States.

The salaries of these officers are paid out of the marine-hospital fund, and it is manifest that this expense is a proper charge against the immigration fund, and the amendment provides the only means of securing this reimbursement. The amendment has had the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Commissioner-General of Immigration.

Respectfully,

WALTER WYMAN,
Surgeon-General.

[Memorandum in case this information is desired.]

In round numbers, the expenditures for immigration work pure and simple from the fund of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service is \$40,000 per annum.

The medical inspection is one of the most important factors in the execution of the immigration law, since it not only excludes contagious and loathsome diseases, but demonstrates infirmities which make the immigrant liable to become a public charge.

WALTER WYMAN,
Surgeon-General United States
Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

FEBRUARY 28, 1903.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. If there is no other amendment, I have an amendment which I wish to submit in the shape of two sections to come in at the end of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as new sections the following:

SEC. — That no person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching such belief in or opposition to all organized government, or who advocates or teaches the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, shall be permitted to enter the United States or any Territory or place sub-

ject to the jurisdiction thereof. This section shall be enforced by the Secretary of the Treasury under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe: *Provided, That no such person shall be allowed to enter as an immigrant.*

That any person who knowingly aids or assists any such person to enter the United States or any Territory or place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or who connives or conspires with any person or persons to allow, procure, or permit any such person to enter therein, except pursuant to such rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned for not less than one nor more than five years, or both.

SEC. — That no person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching such disbelief in or opposition to all organized government, or who advocates or teaches the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or who has violated any of the provisions of this act, shall be naturalized or be made a citizen of the United States.

All courts and tribunals and all judges and officers thereof having jurisdiction of naturalization proceedings or duties to perform in regard thereto shall, on the final application for naturalization, make careful inquiry into such matters, and before issuing the final order or certificate of naturalization cause to be entered of record the affidavit of the applicant and of his witnesses so far as applicable, reciting and affirming the truth of every material fact requisite for naturalization. All final orders and certificates of naturalization hereafter made shall show on their face specifically that said affidavits were duly made and recorded, and all orders and certificates that fail to show such facts shall be null and void.

That any person who purposely procures naturalization in violation of the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or shall be imprisoned not less than one nor more than ten years, or both, and the court in which such conviction is had shall thereupon adjudge and declare the order or decree and all certificates admitting such person to citizenship null and void. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the courts having jurisdiction of the trial of such offense to make such adjudication.

That any person who knowingly aids, advises, or encourages any such person to apply for or to secure naturalization or to file the preliminary papers declaring an intent to become a citizen of the United States, or who in any naturalization proceeding knowingly procures or gives false testimony as to any material fact, or who knowingly makes an affidavit false as to any material fact required to be proved in such proceeding, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not less than one nor more than ten years, or both.

The foregoing provisions concerning naturalization shall not be in force until ninety days after the approval hereof.

Mr. ELKINS. The bill has been so amended, and the amendment just offered is so complicated and so long that I ask that the bill and amendments be printed, to come up on Monday.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from West Virginia will not press that request. It is, of course, manifest that if granted it would kill the bill. If any Senator is unadvised as to what the bill is it is certainly not the fault of the committee.

The bill is a codification mainly of existing laws. It embraces, among other things, very important and necessary administrative features. There is not a bill which has passed this Congress that has had more careful consideration than that which has been given to this bill. The amendments which have been proposed to-night are brief and definite. They are not complicated, they are not abstruse, and no Senator who sat in his seat and heard them read needs time to deliberate on them in order that he may understand them.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that there has been passed by this Congress no measure that is of equal importance with this. I know very well there are strong influences at work against the enactment of this or any similar measure.

There have been objections against several features of the bill. They have been considered, and amendments have been made where amendments were proper and necessary to strengthen it. I do not mean that the objections which have been made have been for other than the best of purposes. I do not mean to say that. Many of the objections which have been made have resulted in improving and in benefiting the measure. Such is the usual experience in considering measures of large importance.

There are those, Mr. President, who are against all immigration legislation. There are those who do not believe that there should be a restriction of immigration. There are those who have been opposed in season and out to the enactment into a law of this bill or any other measure similar in character to it.

One of the chief objections made against the bill was made to the provision for an educational test. I realized that there was sharp and honest difference of opinion with respect to that provision. The committee, appreciating the purpose of those who opposed it and not wishing to jeopardize the many other very important features of the bill, consented that that provision should be stricken out.

What is there in the bill as it stands now that is not found in some form upon the statute books to-day? The larger part of it is essentially a codification of existing law.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator briefly explain just what changes have been made in existing law? I do not want a synopsis, but I want a general outline of the most essential alterations, if there are any. Now, if this is a mere codification, it is not necessary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I will say—

Mr. TILLMAN. I want those essential changes. Of course I know there is a head tax, which is not the present law.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Yes; that is increased from \$1 to \$2.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. There are no essential changes from the present law. There was a very important change proposed by the application of an educational test, but, as I have stated, an amendment has been adopted striking out that provision. That was a very essential change from the existing immigration laws. There are no radical or substantial changes in the bill from the existing laws which are found scattered through many volumes of the statutes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator tell me about the inspection feature? I can not find it. I have been looking for it. Where is the inspection held?

Mr. LODGE. The inspections are held at the ports of entry.

Mr. TILLMAN. After the immigrants get here?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. What is the present law?

Mr. LODGE. That is the present law.

Mr. TILLMAN. They are not inspected on the other side?

Mr. LODGE. No; there is no inspection there.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is no certification in regard to the class of immigrants, paupers, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. LODGE. Certification from whom?

Mr. TILLMAN. From the consul.

Mr. LODGE. We can not have consular certification. That has been gone into with the utmost care. That was tried years ago. That scheme was brought up, and we found that other countries would not permit consular certification.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator mean to say that there is no such thing now as consular certification and examination?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. There never has been.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It has been proposed several times.

Mr. LODGE. It has been proposed several times. It was found that other countries, one country particularly, which it is needless to name, objected to having their citizens go before a foreign consul, and also the people themselves desiring to emigrate objected to it. It was found utterly impracticable. The matter was gone into with the utmost thoroughness by the Senator from New Hampshire at that time, Mr. Chandler, and myself and others.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from South Carolina will permit me, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if there is not some form of examination in foreign countries at the present time?

Mr. LODGE. The steamship companies make some examination of their own. That is done in order to comply with the law and save themselves from bringing improper immigrants, but there is no official inspection. Of course they have to make a manifest.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. They make the ordinary manifest, but that is all the business of the steamship company.

This bill, if the Senator from Indiana will allow me for a moment, is, as he has said, a codification of existing law. That which to my mind was really the only very valuable part of the bill, the educational test, has been dropped out. What remains is an arrangement of the law which will improve its administration, and even that is resisted and fought.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TILLMAN. I would rather vote for a bill that contained the educational qualification for immigrants.

Mr. LODGE. So would I, very much.

Mr. CULLOM. I supposed it was in the bill.

Mr. LODGE. It has been withdrawn and it is not in this last bill. We can save the administrative features, which are of great value, and which the Department desires because it improves the method of administration. That is all that remains in the bill.

Mr. CARMACK. Has the educational qualification been left out of the bill?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. It was taken out last night.

Mr. LODGE. It was withdrawn. It is a House clause and it will have to be settled in conference.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it; and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ELKINS. I ask for the yeas and nays. ["No!" "No!"] Let us see if enough want the yeas and nays.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator knows what that would mean at this time. I hope the Senator—

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator will not press that demand. If it is pressed I shall have something to say about what has been done against this bill.

Mr. ELKINS. I am asking if enough Senators want the yeas and nays to second the call.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator can not experiment with it in that way.

Mr. TILLMAN. The only way the Senator can determine that is to call for a quorum.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not want to call for a quorum, but I want to have the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. I am inclined to think the bill had better go over.

Mr. LODGE. It can not go over without everything else going over.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I trust that the Senator will allow us to vote upon it this evening.

Mr. CULLOM. I was going to move an executive session.

Mr. LODGE. We will call the yeas and nays.

Mr. SPOONER. I am in favor of this bill, and I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will not be inexorable about it. Here is a little bill, a House bill—

Mr. LODGE. I do not want to be inexorable at all, but I should like to have this bill disposed of. It has been before the Senate the whole session. We have made concessions to meet the wishes of the Senator from West Virginia. We have made concessions to meet the wishes of the Senator from New Hampshire. It was understood that these amendments were satisfactory, and that we could get the bill through without further objection. Of course, if the bill is to lead to debate and voting at this late stage of the session it will be lost, which I think will be a great misfortune to the good administration of the law.

Mr. TELLER. Let us have a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a word to say. I am not going to be influenced one particle by either the rather severe language of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] or the threat I heard from the lips of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I am quite willing that the people whom I try to represent should know precisely my attitude on this bill. I thank the Senator from Indiana for conceding to me the privilege of having taken from the bill the words that I called attention to on yesterday.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. In what I said I had no reference, directly or indirectly, to the honorable Senator's attitude upon the bill. That always has been frank, straightforward, and entirely consistent with his duty. I had no reference whatever to him.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have not at any time felt the least inclination to prevent a vote on this bill. I quite agree with what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] said to-day—that if the business of this session had been conducted, as I believe it ought to have been conducted, we would have had a vote on a certain other measure and would have had ample time to have considered all these great questions which are thrust upon us to-day and which we are told must be pushed through because of their great importance.

This bill as it came from another body was an utterly vicious bill. It was either purposely or otherwise aimed at the interest of the section of the country I try to represent. We have had taken from the bill in the limited time we have had to debate it, to consider it, many of those objectionable features. I hope they will not appear in the bill again after the conference has been had, and I want to say here and now that if they do I shall take an opportunity to express my views upon the conference report.

Mr. SPOONER. At length?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; not necessarily at length; but I shall at least enter my protest.

Now, Mr. President, there is one other amendment that I want to have made to this bill. In the first section, for the first time in legislation, an attempt was made to hold the transportation companies, equally with the steamship companies, responsible for the transportation of aliens across the border. These provisions have been taken from the bill, but in turning to page 25 I find a proviso, commencing on line 9 and ending on line 12, which I feel sure ought to be taken from the bill.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. What page?

Mr. GALLINGER. Page 25, section 33. The section reads as follows:

That the Commissioner-General of Immigration, under the direction or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe rules for the entry and inspection of aliens along the borders of Canada and Mexico, so as not to unnecessarily delay, impede, or annoy passengers in ordinary travel between the United States and said countries, and shall have power to enter into contracts with foreign transportation lines for the same purpose.

That is all right. Then comes the proviso:

Provided, That any such transportation line shall agree, as far as practicable—

I want to emphasize those words—

That any such transportation line shall agree, as far as practicable, to assume all the obligations imposed by this act on the masters, agents, and owners of vessels bringing aliens to ports of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, when an alien applies for passage to the agent or owner of a steamship company in Europe, there is time to examine that passenger; there is a system of examination and inquiry; and if a steamship company takes a passenger, the steamship company does it at its own peril, and if the passenger is deported, the steamship company is punished for transporting an undesirable immigrant into the country. But if the immigrant applies on the border line of Canada to take a train, there is no way of determining the question whether that immigrant should be conveyed or not by that transportation company, and to say that the transportation company should be held to make an arrangement that "as far as practicable"—whatever that means in law, I do not know; as a layman, I think it is an absurdity—"as far as practicable to assume all the obligations imposed by this act on the masters, agents, and owners of vessels bringing aliens to ports of the United States," is to my mind something that ought not to be in the bill.

I move, Mr. President, to strike out those words.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is an entirely reasonable amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire moves to strike out the words which he has read.

Mr. GALLINGER. The proviso.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To strike out the proviso. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, a single further word, and I am done. I have had no disposition to obstruct the passage of this bill, but I have wanted to say a great deal more about it than I have said. I have been opposed to many of its features. More than six years ago, I think eight years ago, the country resounded with declarations concerning a bill which received, I think, the approbation of the American people, known as the Lodge bill. That was the bill requiring an educational test. I committed myself to that bill to my own people, and I have never since changed my mind about it.

But this bill goes to conference, if it goes to conference at all, with that wise provision, as I think, eliminated from it, and as I understand—I think I am not giving away any secrets when I say that—there is a tacit understanding that that provision of the bill shall remain out of the bill. I am fearful that the provisions which I have succeeded in getting out will reappear. We all know how these things are done in conference. We know how, when a Senator is anxious to get a bill through at half past 6 o'clock in the evening, when we ought to be at home eating our dinners, that he will agree to let amendments be adopted, and slip from under them very readily in conference. We have all had experience—I have—and so I say, Mr. President, that while the Senator from Indiana insists that this bill has had such careful consideration, the fact remains that in the closing hours of this session, when we have had but a few moments to discuss it, four or five important matters have been taken from it and several important matters have been added to it.

I hope that the bill, Mr. President, if it becomes a law will be a just law; I hope it will not be oppressive to any section of our country. With that single observation, I shall dismiss the matter, only adding the hope that the elimination of these matters, after they have been taken from the bill on my motion, may be insisted upon on the part of our conferees.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I have a few bills which I think are of importance, and I do not see why this bill, though important, should take precedence of all other bills. I could dispose of mine in half the time that this bill has consumed.

I made a reasonable request of the Senator from Indiana to have this bill, with the amendments which have been made, reprinted, so that we can understand it, and then take a vote upon it on Monday.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this bill was brought up at the very beginning of the session, and was made the unfinished business, until it had to give way to the statehood bill by the agreement made at the last session. It was considered here for days; it was reprinted two or three times, and it got through the Committee of the Whole into the Senate. In order to save the bill, these concessions have been made by those who believe in the provisions which have been eliminated as strongly as I do.

I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] that if I should be one of the conferees on the bill, where I have agreed, as I have with him, on the removal of certain sections, I shall feel bound in honor to stand by the removal of those sections, because the bill goes through, as I understand it, only on those conditions.

But, Mr. President, after all these concessions have been made, after the bill has been agreed, as I understand we have agreed upon it, now to kill the bill in this way at the last moment seems to me a very hard measure.

We could have pressed the bill at other times; we could have insisted on the clause to which the Senator from West Virginia

[Mr. ELKINS] objects more than any other—the educational clause—because he thinks it will deprive corporations of a new supply of cheap labor. We could have insisted on that at any time; but to save the administrative features of the bill, we withdrew that in good faith, believing that if we made these large concessions we should be allowed to pass the bill and save its administrative features. If the bill goes over until Monday, it is perfectly well known that in these last two days the chances of saving it are almost nothing.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I find that section 7 of this bill is incorporated in the alien contract-labor law, and I want to ask the chairman of the committee—and that is the reason why I wanted to have the bill reprinted—if that section is stricken out?

Mr. GALLINGER. The alien contract labor provision is stricken out.

Mr. ELKINS. I refer to section 7, on page 8.

Mr. LODGE. That is the contract-labor law as now existing.

Mr. ELKINS. I do not see the necessity of reenacting laws already on the statute book. I understand this is literally the same.

Mr. LODGE. If we are to strike out the contract-labor law, that is a pretty large issue and would deserve to receive a good deal of discussion.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That is one of the settled policies in the legislative history of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. I will say frankly there will be no yielding on that so far as I am concerned. I am not going to consent to modify the contract-labor law.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The committee is unanimous about that. If the bill is to be defeated because of opposition to the contract-labor law now in the closing hours of the session, we would rather have the bill defeated and appeal to another session of Congress.

Mr. ELKINS. I think that would be much the wiser course. I have asked a simple question, and Senators seem to differ as to what the bill means.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If there is one thing which the people demand above another it is that our citizenship and our labor shall not be degraded by bringing people from abroad under contract to labor. Those who come upon their own volition make the best citizens, and those who come because they are hired to come to displace American labor are not desired by us. We must shut the door against them and hold it fast.

Mr. LODGE. We do not differ. That is the contract-labor law now on the statute book. If the Senator wants to go to the country on a modification of that law, I should be delighted to do it with him.

Mr. ELKINS. This thing of going to the country, and legislating about the country, and talking to the galleries—

Mr. LODGE. I am not thinking of the galleries, but I am thinking of the country and something else besides the interest of corporations.

Mr. ELKINS. I know how the Senator occasionally speaks about corporations, but that need not enter into this debate. I am not opposed to corporations as much as the Senator seems to be and I am not particularly in love with them, but that ought not to influence my judgment as to this bill and its effect on immigrants coming to the country.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ELKINS. Certainly.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Does the Senator doubt that this is the contract-labor law as it now stands?

Mr. ELKINS. To be candid about the matter, I can not understand this bill, and I do not know anybody who does. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. I am not speaking of the bill, I am speaking of section 7.

Mr. LODGE. It does not follow, because the Senator from West Virginia does not understand it, that the rest of us do not understand it.

Mr. ELKINS. Do you understand it?

Mr. LODGE. We have explained it, but we can not make the Senator understand our explanation. That is the trouble.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Will the Senator explain the section to which the Senator from West Virginia is referring—section 7?

Mr. GALLINGER. If I may be permitted, I would say, in answer to the Senator from Mississippi, that it is not an exact reproduction of the present alien-contract-labor law, but it is essentially the same.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. It is in substance the same.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is in substance the same. Certain words have been added, such as "and any alien coming to this country in consequence of such an advertisement," etc. Those words are not in the existing law.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Does the Senator desire to repeal the contract-labor law?

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all. I have made no issue on that. I was simply saying that this provision is not an exact reproduction of the contract-labor law, but it is substantially the same.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The Senator from West Virginia will find, in the report made by the committee, a compilation of all the laws upon immigration respecting the prohibition of contract laborers, and he will find those laws in columns parallel with the provisions of this bill. From that he will be able to see the origin of the provisions of the bill before the Senate.

Mr. ELKINS. The Senator does not want me to take that book [exhibiting] and read it? That is the report of the committee, I understand. Any bill that needs a report of 425 printed pages to explain its provisions and make them understood should put Senators on inquiry and require Senators in charge to make proper explanations when asked.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the distinguished and honorable Senator has not read the report of the committee, which was prepared for the information of Senators, he must not charge the committee with any dereliction of duty in not supplying him with information.

Mr. ELKINS. Who would read that book when the statehood bill is up? [Laughter.] I doubt whether any Senator of the committee has read it. I ask the Senator, candidly, if he has read it?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Every member of the committee has read it and is thoroughly familiar with every provision in it.

Mr. ELKINS. Then I do not see how you had time to oppose the statehood bill. [Laughter.]

I heard the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] say that if he were on the conference committee he would adhere to the Senate's interpretation of what this bill ought to be if enacted into law, but I have not heard the chairman of the committee make any expression about it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. With respect to which of these amendments? What amendment does the Senator desire to be informed about?

Mr. ELKINS. I should like to have all the amendments retained in the bill just as the Senate adopted them.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. That is rather a general request. Does the Senator have any specific point about which he wishes to inquire?

Mr. ELKINS. The amendment insisted on by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the one taken out a while ago, and the one providing for the educational test. There are two others. Like the Senator from New Hampshire, I shall be satisfied if we can get from the chairman of the committee the same assurance that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] gave, because he might not be on the conference committee, and the chairman of the committee undoubtedly will be.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I am not the chairman of the committee. I am only acting in the absence of the chairman, who is detained from the Senate. But, speaking for myself, I say that the Senator needs no assurance from me or from any other member of the committee who will be on the conference committee that absolute good faith will be observed.

Mr. ELKINS. I know, but good faith might mean the striking out of every one of these amendments.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. I do not think that would be good faith.

Mr. LODGE. We do not construe good faith in that way.

Mr. ELKINS. I had hoped, and I still hope, to hear from the other conferee. I should like to hear from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] if he would adhere to these amendments. Since the Senator from Massachusetts has volunteered to state as to how he would act in conference, I should like to hear from the others if they will volunteer and declare their intentions. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. I do not know that I shall be on the conference committee, but I will say, if I am, I will act in perfect good faith.

Mr. ELKINS. Good faith, like charity, may cover a multitude of sins.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi. Yes, sir; but good faith, in my judgment, would be that no Senator would be justifiable in abandoning any amendment that was made a condition of the passage of this bill, and I, for one, would not abandon any amendment that was made a condition for the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his point of order.

Mr. HOAR. I am not sure that I can maintain it as a question of order, but I think that I ought to be able to do so.

I do not believe that we have a right to send Senators into a conference with the conferees on the part of the other House and exact pledges in advance from them as to what they are to do as conferees.

We were very indignant, indeed, a year ago when the other House undertook to give an instruction of that kind. If there is anything that can be more objectionable than that, it is to ask gentlemen to get up and pledge themselves as men of honor that they will not go into a free conference. It may be that the members of the House on that conference will present to every one of that committee reasons for abandoning or modifying a particular amendment of the Senate, and if they do, it will be the duty of our conferees to report to the Senate that they think those reasons are good and state them to the Senate when the conference report comes in, so as to allow the Senate to judge of them.

I submit that it is a violation of the rule of order of the Senate and a most disorderly and improper proceeding to ask members of this body to get up and pledge themselves as to what they will do in conference. I do not make the question as a formal question of order, because I do not want that trouble; but I think on this statement my friend from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], who is the very essence of propriety always, as he is of wisdom, of duty, and of good nature [laughter], will abandon it right here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the amendments be ordered to be engrossed?

Mr. ELKINS. I want one word more, if the President will allow me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ELKINS. Before the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] made his very proper remarks and then withdrew the point of order, it so happened that the Senator's colleague [Mr. LODGE] did volunteer the statement—and I never would have asked for the statement I did but for that fact—that the committee of conference would do so and so. I thought it was a crucifixion of all the proprieties myself [laughter], but I thought at the same time if they were all ready to make a declaration in the presence of the Senate, it might help us when the bill went into the committee of conference.

I am in favor of this bill as it stands, if we can keep it as it is; that is, if I understand the bill at all. I have not had time to examine it with care, though I have tried to do so. If I were to undertake to read this report made by the committee, it would keep me at home three or four days, and I could not attend to the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. The conferees will have to report their agreement or their disagreement to the Senate. This is not the last of the matter.

Mr. ELKINS. I know; but conference reports generally get through.

With the assurances I have had, Mr. President, although it is against the proprieties, decorum, good order, and the rules of the Senate, as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], I will not make any further objection to this bill, but will take my chances on the action of the conference committee, giving notice that if these amendments be struck out, I shall try to delay the passage of the bill just as long as I can.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I asked the chairman of the committee a while ago if this was a mere codification of existing law what was the necessity for such a hurry about the passage of this bill, and the Senator from Massachusetts assured me it was merely to save the administrative features of the law.

I hold in my hand the report of the Committee on Immigration of the United States Senate, in which there is a comparison between this bill and the old law, and there is one very essential feature here, to my mind, which has been changed; and I want to ask the chairman of the committee why it has been changed? The old act of March 3, 1893, provides:

SEC. 2. That the immigrants shall be listed in convenient groups, and no one list or manifest shall contain more than 30 names. To each immigrant or head of a family shall be given a ticket, on which shall be written his name, a number or letter designating the list, and his number on the list, for convenience of identification on arrival. Each list or manifest shall be verified by the signature and the oath or affirmation of the master or commanding officer, or of the officer first or second below him in command, taken before the United States consul or consular agent at the port of departure.

This says the consular agent's certificate at the port of departure, whereas the proposed act says "at the port of arrival." In other words, you get these people across, the steamship companies make the money that is involved in their transportation, and then they are turned loose after they get here.

Mr. LODGE. That has been changed for the better enforcement of the law, at the request of the Department and on their statement that they had no control over those lists; that they were passed without any examination and without any inspection by the consular agent, wholly and solely on the manifest of the ship. It was done for the better enforcement of the law. At the port of arrival we can control those lists and we can examine the immigrants to see whether they correspond, but on the other side we have no proper way of controlling or corroborating the lists. The change was made as a great improvement in administration,

to enable the lists to be examined here; and it was done at the request of the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will give me some information on another point. I can not find the section now, but I had it a few minutes ago; and in reading it I found these steamship companies were required to transport these people back "if practicable."

Mr. LODGE. No; that was in the clause in regard to transportation of aliens by railroad companies over the border.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; by steamship companies "if practicable." I can find it if I have the time.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is mistaken. It was a proviso called to our attention by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], which said the same obligation should be imposed on railroad companies.

Mr. TILLMAN. Wait a minute. I just happen to have put my eye on the provision. Section 20 of this bill reads:

That all aliens brought into this country in violation of law shall, if practicable, be immediately sent back to the countries whence they respectively came on the vessels bringing them.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; on the vessels bringing them, if it is practicable to do so on the same vessel, but if not, then on another vessel.

Mr. TILLMAN. And "if not practicable" to return them on the same ship they are turned loose while waiting for another ship.

Mr. LODGE. They can not get loose between the ships, for they are kept at Ellis Island; but they may be detained a longer time than if they went back on the return voyage of the same ship.

Mr. HOAR. Would the Senator from South Carolina have them sent back if it is not practicable?

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Massachusetts is always getting off some joke, and thinks it is very smart. He is very learned and very smart sometimes, but these little "ifs" and "ands" and "buts," as we all understand, have frequently changed the meaning of a statute.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think I have got off or attempted to get off any joke.

Mr. TILLMAN. What, then, did the Senator mean?

Mr. HOAR. I did not mean to throw ridicule on the Senator from South Carolina at all. I only proposed to point out that what he said was ridiculous.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator thinks it is ridiculous, that is all right, but I do not think it is ridiculous, because if the inspection is as rigid as it ought to be, and we have the sworn statement that the inspection is thorough, the improper immigrants will be discovered, and they will be sent back on the return voyage instead of being held until they get a chance to sneak away.

Mr. LODGE. The only purpose of that clause is to get them back on the same vessel, if possible. It may be impossible to conduct the necessary examination in the interval, and then they go back on another vessel of the same line.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not find any such provision here.

Mr. LODGE. There is such a provision, as the Senator will find if he examines the bill. The companies are obliged to pay the cost of the maintenance of the immigrants on land.

Mr. TILLMAN. Section 20 provides that:

The cost of their maintenance while on land, as well as the expense of the return of such aliens, shall be borne by the owner or owners of the vessels on which they respectively came.

Mr. LODGE (reading):

And if any master, person in charge, agent, owner, or consignee of any such vessels shall refuse to receive back on board thereof, or of any other vessel owned by the same interest—

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have a vote.

Mr. SPOONER and others. "Vote!"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the amendments be ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

WISCONSIN CENTRAL RAILROAD, ETC., GRANTS.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11572) for the relief of certain settlers upon Wisconsin Central Railroad and The Dalles military road land grants.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. I move in lines 17, 18, 19, and 20, on page 2, to strike out:

but no patent shall issue upon any such entry except upon proof of residence upon and improvement and cultivation of the land so entered for at least one year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LIFE-SAVING STATION, BLACK RIVER, OHIO.

Mr. HANNA. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 14384) to establish a life-saving station at the mouth of Black River, at or near the city of Lorain, in the State of Ohio.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will give me time to pass the bill I had up this morning.

Mr. CARMACK. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will yield.

Mr. KEAN. Certainly I will.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Maine objected—

Mr. KEAN. I withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill referred to by the Senator from South Carolina is not here. It has been sent down to be printed. It has been sent for.

KENSEY J. HAMPTON.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill of only nine lines. It will take but a moment. It is the bill (H. R. 15243) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Kensey J. Hampton captain and quartermaster in the Army.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment in line 3, after the word "discretion," to insert "and upon such examination as he may prescribe;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States in his discretion and upon such examination as he may prescribe be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Kensey J. Hampton, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, to the grade of captain and quartermaster, United States Army, to fill the first or any subsequent vacancy in said grade in the Quartermaster's Department occurring after the passage of this act.

Mr. BATE. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask that it be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE AT PARIS.

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina to call up the bill which was read this morning.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 7368) to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to know just how the bill stands, because the Senator from Maine insisted on two other little amendments which I wish to offer now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments proposed by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to strike out section 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move to strike out section 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seventeen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, the understanding being that no legislative business of any character whatever shall then be transacted and that the meeting of the Senate is only for the purpose of delivering eulogies on the deceased members of the House, of which notice has been given.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Sunday, March 1, 1903, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1903.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Henry B. F. Macfarland, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from May 5, 1903, to fill a vacancy caused by the expiration of his own term of office.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Ordinance Department.

First Lieut. William H. Tschappat, Ordinance Department, to be captain, February 18, 1903, vice Borup, promoted.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles D. Eddy, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for the district of Bristol and Warren in the State of Rhode Island. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Harry H. Youngken, to be postmaster at Santa Paula, in the county of Ventura and State of California, in place of Harry H. Youngken. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1903.

CONNECTICUT.

Ira E. Hicks, to be postmaster at New Britain, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut, in place of William S. Judd. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

Jacob Widmer, to be postmaster at New Hartford, in the county of Litchfield and State of Connecticut, in place of Ranney G. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1903.

HAWAII.

Frank Crawford, to be postmaster at Lihue, in the county of Kauai Island, Hawaii Territory, in place of William T. Lucas, resigned.

IDAHO.

John L. Chapman, to be postmaster at Lewiston, in the county of Nez Perces and State of Idaho, in place of John L. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1903.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

John W. Bayless, to be postmaster at Sapulpa, in the county of Creek Nation, Ind. T., in place of John W. Bayless, deceased.

ILLINOIS.

L. B. Davis, to be postmaster at Lincoln, in the county of Logan and State of Illinois, in place of Samuel L. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

John P. Williams, to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois, in place of John P. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1902.

MARYLAND.

Winfield S. Wolfe, to be postmaster at Union Bridge, in the county of Carroll and State of Maryland. Office became Presidential October 1, 1902.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George A. Wales, to be postmaster at Stoughton, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in place of Charles T. Drake, deceased.

MICHIGAN.

S. V. Bullock, to be postmaster at Howard City, in the county of Montcalm and State of Michigan, in place of Orlando J. Knapp. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1903.

MINNESOTA.

T. T. Gronlund, to be postmaster at Tyler, in the county of Lincoln and State of Minnesota. Office became Presidential July 1, 1902.

Thomas M. Paine, to be postmaster at Glencoe, in the county of McLeod and State of Minnesota, in place of Thomas M. Paine. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1903.

Emma C. Taylor, to be postmaster at Chaska, in the county of Carver and State of Minnesota. Office became Presidential January 1, 1903.

MISSOURI.

William B. Lewis, to be postmaster at Eldorado Springs, in the county of Cedar and State of Missouri, in place of William B. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1902.

Nellie S. Van Matre, to be postmaster at Warrensburg, in the county of Johnson and State of Missouri, in place of Peter C. Van Matre, resigned.

Wesley W. Wehrli, to be postmaster at Mound City, in the county of Holt and State of Missouri, in place of Wesley W. Wehrli. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1903.

MONTANA.

Herbert O. Chowen, to be postmaster at Great Falls, in the county of Cascade and State of Montana, in place of Herbert O. Chowen. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1903.

NEBRASKA.

M. Emmington, to be postmaster at Pender, in the county of Thurston and State of Nebraska, in place of John W. Huntsberger, deceased.

NEW JERSEY.

Oscar Jeffery, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Warren and State of New Jersey, in place of Oscar Jeffery. Incumbent's commission expired July 7, 1902.

William Proudfoot, to be postmaster at Roselle, in the county of Union and State of New Jersey, in place of Theodore C. Starr, deceased.

OHIO.

George B. Alaback, to be postmaster at East Palestine, in the county of Columbiana and State of Ohio, in place of George B. Alaback. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1903.

NEW YORK.

George G. Roe, to be postmaster at Clyde, in the county of Wayne and State of New York, in place of George G. Roe. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1903.

OREGON.

Marion F. Davis, to be postmaster at Union, in the county of Union and State of Oregon, in place of Marion F. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1903.

Chester A. Martin, to be postmaster at Ontario, in the county of Malheur and State of Oregon. Office became Presidential October 1, 1902.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Caleb S. Brinton, to be postmaster at Carlisle, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Charles F. Humrich. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1902.

W. V. Campbell, to be postmaster at McKeesport, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania, in place of William E. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1903.

George W. Honsaker, to be postmaster at Masontown, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential January 1, 1903.

Harry W. Hummel, to be postmaster at Northumberland, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Thomas L. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1902.

Jacob G. Geltz, to be postmaster at Milton, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Manfred H. Barr. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1903.

Anna H. Griscom, to be postmaster at Jenkintown, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Anna H. Griscom. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1903.

William J. Noll, to be postmaster at Myerstown, in the county of Lebanon and State of Pennsylvania, in place of William J. Noll. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1903.

Nora L. Pickering, to be postmaster at Peckville, in the county of Lackawanna and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Uriah V. Mace, deceased.

George H. Reitenbaugh, to be postmaster at Ardmore, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of George H. Reitenbaugh. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1903.

John S. Weaver, to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of John S. Weaver. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

Robert E. Woodside, to be postmaster at Millersburg, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Robert E. Woodside. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1903.

Samuel E. Worth, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Samuel E. Worth. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1903.

Cyrus F. Zimmerman, to be postmaster at Palmyra, in the county of Lebanon and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Cyrus F. Zimmerman. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1903.

TEXAS.

Otto Heilig, to be postmaster at New Braunfels, in the county of Comal and State of Texas, in place of Otto Heilig. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1903.

Leander Hopkins, to be postmaster at Ferris, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1903.

Ulysses G. Roach, to be postmaster at Celeste, in the county of Hunt and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1903.

VERMONT.

Emeroy G. Page, to be postmaster at Hyde Park, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont, in place of Emeroy G. Page. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1903.

WASHINGTON.

John F. Irby, to be postmaster at Ritzville, in the county of Adams and State of Washington, in place of George Sinclair. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1903.

Howard M. Spalding, to be postmaster at Goldendale, in the county of Klickitat and State of Washington, in place of Howard M. Spalding. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1903.

WEST VIRGINIA.

D. P. Stout, to be postmaster at West Union, in the county of Doddridge and State of West Virginia, in place of Amos A. Bee. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1903.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28, 1903.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Frank L. Campbell, of Ohio, to be Assistant Attorney-General.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Melville W. Miller, of Lafayette, Ind., to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

INDIAN AGENT.

Lucius A. Wright, of California, to be agent for the Indians of the Mission Tule River Agency in California.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Nelson F. Handy, of Colorado, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Denver, in the State of Colorado.

ASSAYER AND MELTER.

Daniel Kirby Pope, of North Carolina, to be assayer and melter of the United States assay office at Charlotte, N. C.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Frederick W. S. Dean, a citizen of South Carolina, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 26th day of January, 1903.

Richard L. Sutton, a citizen of Missouri, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 26th day of January, 1903.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

1. Lieut. Commander Samuel W. B. Diehl, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 11th day of July, 1902.

2. Lieut. (Junior Grade) David W. Todd, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1902.

3. Lieut. (Junior Grade) John V. Klemann, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 16th day of September, 1902.

4. Lieut. Harry Hall, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 17th day of September, 1902.

5. Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry V. Butler, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 17th day of September, 1902.

6. Lieut. (Junior Grade) James J. Raby, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1902.

7. Lieut. Edwards F. Leiper, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of October, 1902.

8. Lieut. (Junior Grade) James E. Walker, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of October, 1902.

9. Lieut. William H. Alderdice, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 7th day of November, 1902.

10. Lieut. Louis S. Van Duzer, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 21st day of November, 1902.

11. Lieut. (Junior Grade) Cassius B. Barnes, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 21st day of November, 1902.

12. Lieut. (Junior Grade) Kenneth M. Bennett, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 21st day of November, 1902.

13. Lieut. William J. Maxwell, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of December, 1902.

14. Lieut. (Junior Grade) John F. Marshall, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of January, 1903.

15. Lieut. John F. Luby, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 4th day of January, 1903.

16. Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ernest F. Eckhardt, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 4th day of January, 1903.

17. Commander Holland N. Stevenson, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 10th day of February, 1903.

18. Lieut. Commander George H. Peters, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 10th day of February, 1903.

1. Lieut. Wilson W. Buchanan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of December, 1902.

2. Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas D. Parker, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 10th day of February, 1903.

3. Lieut. (Junior Grade) Jonas H. Holden, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 14th day of February, 1903.

1. Paymaster Charles M. Ray, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1902.

2. Assistant Paymaster Arthur H. Cathcart, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1902.

3. Assistant Paymaster Eugene F. Hall, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 28th day of September, 1902.

4. Pay Inspector James E. Cann, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 5th day of January, 1903.

5. Assistant Paymaster William T. Wallace, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 5th day of January, 1903.

6. Passed Assistant Paymaster Charles Conard, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 11th day of January, 1903.

7. Assistant Paymaster Victor S. Jackson, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 11th day of January, 1903.

8. Paymaster Livingston Hunt, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 19th day of January, 1903.

9. Assistant Paymaster John R. Sanford, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 19th day of January, 1903.

1. Asst. Surg. Henry E. Odell, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 8th day of November, 1902.

2. Asst. Surg. James S. Taylor, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 8th day of November, 1902.

3. P. A. Surg. Sheldon G. Evans, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 29th day of November, 1902.

4. Surg. David O. Lewis, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 4th day of January, 1903.

5. P. A. Surg. Adrian R. Alfred, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 4th day of January, 1903.

6. Surg. Howard E. Ames, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 20th day of January, 1903.

7. P. A. Surg. John E. Page, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 20th day of January, 1903.

8. Medical Inspector Thomas H. Streets, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 31st day of January, 1903.

9. Surg. Frank Anderson, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 31st day of January, 1903.

10. P. A. Surg. Middleton S. Guest, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 31st day of January, 1903.

1. Passed Assistant Paymaster William T. Gray, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 19th day of January, 1903.

2. Medical Inspector James R. Waggener, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 20th day of January, 1903.

Pay Inspector Stephen Rand, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1902.

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, from the 4th day of April, 1903:

1. John Halligan, jr.

2. William C. Watts.

3. George L. Smith.

4. Wilbur G. Briggs.

5. Fletcher L. Sheffield.

6. Ralph N. Marble, jr.

7. Henry C. Dinger.

8. Lyman A. Cotten.

9. Edward Woods.

10. Louis Shane.

11. Alexander N. Mitchell.

12. Edward W. McIntyre.

13. Frank L. Pinney.

14. William P. Cronan.

15. Ulysses S. Macy.

16. Zeno E. Briggs.

17. William T. Tarrant.

18. Walter B. Tardy.

19. William B. Wells.

20. Clarence A. Abele.

21. Thomas L. Johnson.

22. Yancey S. Williams.

23. Edward T. Constien.

24. George T. Pettengill.

25. John A. Schofield.

26. George C. Sweet.

27. Frank T. Evans.

28. Morris H. Brown.

29. David C. Hanrahan.

30. John F. Babcock.

31. John S. Graham.

32. Charles P. Nelson.

33. Walter G. Roper.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Winston Pilcher, Fourteenth Cavalry, February 17, 1902.

Second Lieut. Frederick M. Jones, Second Cavalry, February 19, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Christian Briand, First Cavalry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. John A. Wagner, Tenth Cavalry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Archie Miller, Second Cavalry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William S. Wells, jr., Tenth Cavalry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William H. Clopton, jr., Thirteenth Cavalry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert M. Nolan, Third Cavalry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William O. Reed, Third Cavalry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Henry Gibbins, Tenth Cavalry, March 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Charles O. Thomas, jr., First Cavalry, March 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Casper W. Cole, Ninth Cavalry, March 9, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Edmond R. Tompkins, Eleventh Cavalry, March 24, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Arthur Poillon, Third Cavalry, April 3, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Gordon N. Kimball, Third Cavalry, April 23, 1901.
 Second Lieut. George A. Purington, Third Cavalry, April 29, 1901.
 Second Lieut. George W. Biegler, Seventh Cavalry, May 29, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Francis W. Glover, First Cavalry, May 31, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Lawrence S. Carson, Eighth Cavalry, June 30, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Alexander B. Coxe, Eighth Cavalry, July 9, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Timothy M. Coughlan, Second Cavalry, August 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Leonard L. Deitrick, Thirteenth Cavalry, September 17, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Richard B. Going, Second Cavalry, October 15, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Hamilton Bowie, Ninth Cavalry, October 29, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Frederick G. Turner, Sixth Cavalry, November 12, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Frederick J. Herman, Tenth Cavalry, December 6, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Ben Lear, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry, December 9, 1901.
 Second Lieut. George P. Tyner, Seventh Cavalry, December 18, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Albert J. Woude, Sixth Cavalry, January 17, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Walter F. Martin, Second Cavalry, January 31, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Philip Mowry, Fourth Cavalry, February 6, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Henry J. McKenney, Seventh Cavalry, February 22, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Oscar A. McGee, Ninth Cavalry, March 31, 1902.
 Second Lieut. John S. E. Young, Eighth Cavalry, June 9, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Raymond S. Enslow, Fifteenth Cavalry, June 20, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Oliver P. M. Hazzard, Third Cavalry, June 28, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Charles C. Winnia, Fifth Cavalry, July 8, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Frank T. McNarney, Ninth Cavalry, July 15, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Thomas M. Knox, Second Cavalry, July 25, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Basil N. Rittenhouse, Eleventh Cavalry, July 25, 1902.
 Second Lieut. William R. Taylor, Third Cavalry, July 30, 1902.
 Second Lieut. John P. Hasson, Sixth Cavalry, August 22, 1902.
 Second Lieut. William E. W. MacKinlay, Ninth Cavalry, September 13, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Gordon Johnston, Tenth Cavalry, October 4, 1902.
 Second Lieut. William A. Austin, Seventh Cavalry, October 29, 1902.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Alfred S. Morgan, Artillery Corps, November 4, 1901.
 First Lieut. Charles H. Hilton, jr., Artillery Corps, November 8, 1901.
 First Lieut. Edward L. Glasgow, Artillery Corps, January 31, 1902.
 First Lieut. Leo F. Foster, Artillery Corps, February 21, 1902.
 First Lieut. Percy Willis, Artillery Corps, April 5, 1902.
 First Lieut. William F. Stewart, jr., Artillery Corps, June 3, 1902.
 First Lieut. Joseph B. Douglas, Artillery Corps, June 18, 1902.

First Lieut. Hudson T. Patten, Artillery Corps, July 22, 1902.
 First Lieut. Harrison Hall, Artillery Corps, July 30, 1902.
 First Lieut. Edward Kimmel, Artillery Corps, September 11, 1902.
 First Lieut. Wright Smith, Artillery Corps, September 20, 1902.
 First Lieut. John R. Procter, jr., Artillery Corps, November 6, 1902.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Robert W. Collins, Artillery Corps, August 23, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Samuel C. McAlister, Artillery Corps, September 21, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert J. Arnold, Artillery Corps, October 29, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William A. Covington, Artillery Corps, November 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Francis W. Griffin, Artillery Corps, November 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Elisha G. Abbott, Artillery Corps, November 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Roy I. Taylor, Artillery Corps, January 31, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Samuel M. English, Artillery Corps, February 21, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Marion B. Wilhoit, Artillery Corps, March 4, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Alfred Hasbrouck, Artillery Corps, April 5, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Guilford S. Garber, Artillery Corps, June 3, 1902.
 Second Lieut. John M. Dunn, Artillery Corps, June 18, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Carroll Power, Artillery Corps, June 21, 1902.
 Second Lieut. James L. Long, Artillery Corps, June 21, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Garrison Ball, Artillery Corps, July 22, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Robert S. Welsh, Artillery Corps, July 30, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Ralph M. Mitchell, Artillery Corps, August 7, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Frederick L. Dengler, Artillery Corps, September 10, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Richard H. Williams, Artillery Corps, September 11, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Walter V. Cotchett, Artillery Corps, September 17, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Alfred M. Mason, Artillery Corps, September 20, 1902.
 Second Lieut. John J. Lipop, Artillery Corps, November 6, 1902.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Ernest H. Agnew, Twenty-sixth Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert O. Ragsdale, Third Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Albert J. Bright, Second Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Granville L. Chapman, Tenth Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Austin A. Parker, Twenty-fourth Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William E. Mould, Sixteenth Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Rhees Jackson, Twelfth Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Charles M. Gordon, jr., Sixteenth Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Fred Van S. Chamberlain, Second Infantry, February 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William N. Hughes, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, March 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Sylvester Bonnaffon, 3d, Thirteenth Infantry, March 2, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert C. Humber, Tenth Infantry, March 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Hunter Kinzie, Twentieth Infantry, March 5, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Joseph C. Brady, Fourth Infantry, March 9, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William K. Armstrong, Twenty-third Infantry, March 11, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert S. Clark, Ninth Infantry, March 14, 1901.
 Second Lieut. John H. Page, jr., Third Infantry, March 19, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Parker Hitt, Twenty-second Infantry, March 21, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Paul W. Beck, Fifth Infantry, March 25, 1901.
 Second Lieut. John W. Norwood, Twenty-third Infantry, April 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert I. Rees, Third Infantry, April 9, 1901.

Second Lieut. Edward C. Bolton, Seventeenth Infantry, April 11, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Jesse M. Cullison, Second Infantry, April 13, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William E. Bennett, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, April 15, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William H. Noble, Thirteenth Infantry, April 16, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Sidney S. Burbank, Sixth Infantry, April 19, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Albert C. Osborn, Twentieth Infantry, April 22, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Andrew C. Wright, Twelfth Infantry, April 26, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Wilbur A. McDaniel, Third Infantry, May 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Evert R. Wilson, Tenth Infantry, May 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Frank W. Ball, Eighteenth Infantry, May 13, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Henry A. Wiegenstein, Twenty-fifth Infantry, May 20, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Haywood Robbins, Fifteenth Infantry, June 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Clenard McLaughlin, Twenty-first Infantry, June 10, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Edward B. Mitchell, Twenty-fourth Infantry, June 12, 1901.
 Second Lieut. James H. Como, Twenty-fifth Infantry, June 23, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Harold D. Coburn, Twenty-fifth Infantry, July 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Allen J. Greer, Fourth Infantry, July 1, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert Whitfield, Twenty-second Infantry, July 5, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Louis McL. Hamilton, Fourteenth Infantry, July 6, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Edwin E. Carroll, First Infantry, July 11, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Arthur W. Brown, Twenty-seventh Infantry, July 13, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Abraham U. Loeb, Ninth Infantry, July 23, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Charles J. Nelson, Seventeenth Infantry, July 23, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William B. Baker, Eighteenth Infantry, July 26, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Constant Cordier, Fifth Infantry, September 22, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Frank A. Aul, Sixth Infantry, September 24, 1901.
 Second Lieut. James M. Loud, Seventh Infantry, September 27, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Edmund S. Sayer, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, September 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. J. De Camp Hall, Twenty-fifth Infantry, September 28, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert G. Rutherford, jr., Twenty-fourth Infantry, October 5, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Davis C. Anderson, Sixth Infantry, October 7, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Robert D. Carter, Twelfth Infantry, October 15, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Douglas Potts, Eighteenth Infantry, October 15, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Whipple, jr., Twelfth Infantry, October 16, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Kent Browning, Thirteenth Infantry, October 30, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Stephen O. Fuqua, Twenty-third Infantry, November 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Vincent M. Elmore, jr., Fifth Infantry, November 7, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Augustus F. W. Macmanus, Twenty-fifth Infantry, November 8, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Wade, Tenth Infantry, November 8, 1901.
 Second Lieut. George E. Goodrich, Thirteenth Infantry, November 11, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Charles W. Barber, Second Infantry, November 11, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Edwin S. Hartshorn, Fourteenth Infantry, November 11, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Clark R. Elliott, Tenth Infantry, November 29, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William P. Screws, Nineteenth Infantry, December 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Ralph B. Lister, Tenth Infantry, December 4, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Harry E. Comstock, Twenty-seventh Infantry, December 17, 1901.
 Second Lieut. William R. Standiford, Second Infantry, December 17, 1901.

Second Lieut. Frederick S. Young, Seventeenth Infantry, December 17, 1901.
 Second Lieut. Richard W. Buchanan, Ninth Infantry, January 2, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Thomas S. Moorman, jr., Seventeenth Infantry, January 11, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Morrow, Eighteenth Infantry, January 12, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Lorenzo D. Gasser, Twenty-first Infantry, January 14, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Brady G. Ruttencutter, First Infantry, January 22, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Jennings B. Wilson, Seventeenth Infantry, January 31, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Charles B. Stone, jr., Sixteenth Infantry, March 8, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Howard G. Young, Sixth Infantry, March 10, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Augustus H. Bishop, Second Infantry, March 12, 1902.
 Second Lieut. William O. Smith, Seventh Infantry, March 12, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Clarence K. La Motte, Eighteenth Infantry, March 21, 1902.
 Second Lieut. George M. Holley, Fourth Infantry, March 28, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Edgar S. Stayer, Twenty-third Infantry, April 2, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Charles H. Errington, Eleventh Infantry, April 3, 1902.
 Second Lieut. George C. Shaw, Thirteenth Infantry, April 5, 1902.
 Second Lieut. William H. Plummer, Third Infantry, April 14, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Charles E. Reese, Fifteenth Infantry, April 14, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Charles S. Tarlton, First Infantry, April 15, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Robert S. Knox, Twenty-fourth Infantry, May 2, 1902.
 Second Lieut. William A. Castle, Sixteenth Infantry, May 5, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Arthur F. Halpin, Eighth Infantry, May 9, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Harry D. Blasland, Twenty-sixth Infantry, May 26, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Robert K. Spiller, Twenty-sixth Infantry, May 28, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Charles C. Allen, Thirtieth Infantry, May 28, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Edward H. Andres, Eighth Infantry, May 28, 1902.
 Second Lieut. John W. Ward, Twentieth Infantry, June 9, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Robert O. Patterson, Twenty-ninth Infantry, June 13, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Thomas J. Rogers, Twenty-eighth Infantry, June 15, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Edwin J. Bracken, Twentieth Infantry, June 21, 1902.
 Second Lieut. George W. England, Sixth Infantry, June 23, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Edwin J. Nowlen, First Infantry, June 28, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Clyde B. Parker, Sixth Infantry, June 28, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Alvin C. Voris, Second Infantry, July 4, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Frank R. Curtis, Sixth Infantry, July 8, 1902.
 Second Lieut. John M. Kelso, jr., Thirteenth Infantry, July 10, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Fred L. Davidson, Fourth Infantry, July 15, 1902.
 Second Lieut. George E. Kumpke, Twenty-eighth Infantry, July 17, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Leonard T. Baker, Nineteenth Infantry, July 30, 1902.
 Second Lieut. George R. D. MacGregor, Eighteenth Infantry, September 2, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Milo C. Corey, Thirtieth Infantry, September 5, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Rowland S. Pike, Twentieth Infantry, September 18, 1902.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Arthur M. Ferguson, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, September 24, 1902.
 Second Lieut. Thomas B. Crockett, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 3, 1902.
 Second Lieut. David A. Snyder, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 7, 1902.

CAVALRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Rudolph E. Smyser, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, November 22, 1902.

Second Lieut. Joseph C. Righter, jr., Eighth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, December 8, 1902.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

4. First Lieut. Robert H. C. Kelton, Artillery Corps, to be captain, December 20, 1902.

5. Second Lieut. Kenneth C. Masteller, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant, December 20, 1902.

First Lieut. Frederick W. Phisterer, Artillery Corps, to be captain, December 3, 1902.

Second Lieut. Lewis S. Ryan, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant, December 3, 1902.

First Lieut. Peter C. Hains, jr., Artillery Corps, to be captain, December 30, 1902.

Second Lieut. Tilman Campbell, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant, December 30, 1902.

First Lieut. Winfred B. Carr, Artillery Corps, to be captain, February 21, 1903.

Second Lieut. John V. Green, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant, February 21, 1903.

Second Lieut. Charles E. T. Lull, Thirteenth Infantry, from the Infantry Arm to the Artillery Corps.

CAVALRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Consuelo A. Seoane, Third Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, January 30, 1903.

1. Lieut. Col. Charles Morton, Eighth Cavalry, to be colonel, February 25, 1903.

2. Maj. Henry P. Kingsbury, Third Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel, February 25, 1903.

3. Capt. Hugh L. Scott, Seventh Cavalry, to be major, February 25, 1903.

4. First Lieut. Edward P. Orton, Second Cavalry, to be captain, February 25, 1903.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. John T. Dunn, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 11, 1902.

Second Lieut. De Witt W. Chamberlin, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 18, 1902.

Second Lieut. Kaolin L. Whitson, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant, October 21, 1902.

Second Lieut. Walter H. Johnson, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 8, 1902.

Second Lieut. Robert E. Grinstead, Twenty-third Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 28, 1902.

Second Lieut. Albert S. Williams, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, December 3, 1902.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Capt. Lansing H. Beach, Corps of Engineers, to be major, February 20, 1903.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Hockley T. Hamill, to be postmaster at Georgetown, in the county of Clear Creek and State of Colorado.

CONNECTICUT.

Ira E. Hicks, to be postmaster at New Britain, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Wilbur W. Smith, to be postmaster at Seymour, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

IDAHO.

William D. Hardwick, to be postmaster at Nezperce, in the county of Nez Perces and State of Idaho.

IOWA.

John C. Campbell, to be postmaster at Bellevue, in the county of Jackson and State of Iowa.

James M. Carl, to be postmaster at Lone Tree, in the county of Johnson and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

John P. Harris, to be postmaster at Ottawa, in the county of Franklin and State of Kansas.

W. P. Bosworth, to be postmaster at Paola, in the county of Miami and State of Kansas.

Asbury L. McMillan, to be postmaster at Stafford, in the county of Stafford and State of Kansas.

John H. Nichols, to be postmaster at Kiowa, in the county of Barber and State of Kansas.

E. V. Peterson, to be postmaster at Norton, in the county of Norton and State of Kansas.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John S. Fay, to be postmaster at Marlboro, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Sidney E. Lawrence, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Lenawee and State of Michigan.

MISSOURI.

William A. Ulery, to be postmaster at Elsberry, in the county of Lincoln and State of Missouri.

William T. Elliott, to be postmaster at Houston, in the county of Texas and State of Missouri.

Frederick B. Rauch, to be postmaster at Morehouse, in the county of New Madrid and State of Missouri.

Frederick C. Sasse, to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Chariton and State of Missouri.

Nellie S. Van Matre, to be postmaster at Warrensburg, in the county of Johnson and State of Missouri.

NEBRASKA.

Dennis H. Cronin, to be postmaster at O'Neill, in the county of Holt and State of Nebraska.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Natt A. Cram, to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

RHODE ISLAND.

James E. Bowen, to be postmaster at Central Falls, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Evan J. Edwards, to be postmaster at Bowdle, in the county of Edmunds and State of South Dakota.

TEXAS.

William McManis, to be postmaster at Baird, in the county of Callahan and State of Texas.

Louis Weete, to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Colorado and State of Texas.

Erwin W. Owen, to be postmaster at Eagle Pass, in the county of Maverick and State of Texas.

Henry J. Veltmann, to be postmaster at Brackettville, in the county of Kinney and State of Texas.

VIRGINIA.

William H. Parker, to be postmaster at Onancock, in the county of Accomac and State of Virginia.

H. B. Nichols, to be postmaster at Norfolk, in the county of Norfolk and State of Virginia.

WISCONSIN.

Fred Reitz, to be postmaster at Neillsville, in the county of Clark and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, February 28, 1903.

[Continuation of legislative day of February 26, 1903.]

The recess having expired, the House, at 11 o'clock a. m., was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a Republican House we can not do any business without a quorum, except to turn out a member! I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first count, to see whether there is a quorum present or not. [After counting the House.] One hundred and seventy-eight members present—a quorum.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Of course, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will suspend to receive a message from the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 17288. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 6139) to provide for the organization of private corporations in the district of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. R. 169. Joint resolution providing for the placing of bronze tablets on the custom-house and post-office building in Savannah, Ga.;

S. 7390. An act to ratify and amend an agreement with the Sioux tribe of Indians of the Rosebud Reservation, in South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry same into effect;

S. 6599. An act to provide a government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes; and

S. 7054. An act to provide a government for the island of Tutuila and the islands adjacent thereto within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 16573. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across St. Francis River at or near the town of St. Francis, Ark.; and

H. R. 16885. An act to extend to the port of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 16656. An act regulating the importation of breeding animals; and

H. R. 16775. An act establishing United States courts at Duncan, Maryetta, and Comanche, Ind. T.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 17202) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. HALE, and Mr. COCKRELL as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 16910) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PROCTOR, Mr. HANSBROUGH, and Mr. BATE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 16990) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MASON, Mr. PENROSE, and Mr. CLAY as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. ALGER, and Mr. PETTUS as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the naval appropriation bill with Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the amendments of the Senate to said bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.
Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if the report was read in full?

The SPEAKER. The amendments were read in full. The question is, Will the House disagree to said amendments en bloc and ask a conference with the Senate?

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I demand a division.

Mr. SHERMAN. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 253, nays 0, answered "present" 6, not voting 92; as follows:

YEAS—253.

Acheson,	Breazeale,	Clark,	Dinsmore,
Adams,	Brick,	Clayton,	Dougherty,
Adamson,	Bromwell,	Conner,	Dovener,
Alexander,	Broussard,	Cooper, Tex.	Draper,
Allen, Ky.	Brown,	Cooper, Wis.	Driscoll,
Allen, Mo.	Brownlow,	Corliss,	Dwight,
Applin,	Brundidge,	Cousins,	Eddy,
Eabcock,	Burgess,	Cowherd,	Emerson,
Ball, Del.	Burt, Pa.	Cromer,	Esch,
Barney,	Burke, S. Dak.	Crowley,	Evans,
Bartholdt,	Burkett,	Crumacker,	Finley,
Bartlett,	Burleigh,	Currier,	Fitzgerald,
Bates,	Burleson,	Curtis,	Fletcher,
Beidler,	Burton,	Cushman,	Flood,
Benton,	Butler,	Dahle,	Forney,
Bilmeier,	Calderhead,	Dalzell,	Foss,
Bishop,	Caldwell,	Darragh,	Foster, Vt.
Boreing,	Candler,	Davidson,	Fox,
Boutell,	Capron,	De Armond,	Gaines, Tenn.
Bowersock,	Cassell,	Deemer,	Gaines, W. Va.
Brandegoe,	Cassingham,	Dick,	Gardner, Mass.

Gardner, Mich.	Kluttz,	Needham,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Gardner, N. J.	Knapp,	Olmsted,	Snook,
Gibson,	Kyle,	Otjen,	Southard,
Gilbert,	Lacey,	Overstreet,	Southwick,
Gill,	Landis,	Padgett,	Sparkman,
Gillet, N. Y.	Latimer,	Palmer,	Sperry,
Gillet, Mass.	Lawrence,	Parker,	Stark,
Goldfogle,	Lessler,	Patterson, Pa.	Steele,
Gordon,	Lester,	Payne,	Stephens, Tex.
Graff,	Lever,	Pearne,	Storm,
Greene, Mass.	Lewis, Ga.	Perkins,	Sullivan,
Grosvenor,	Lewis, Pa.	Pierce,	Swann,
Grow,	Littauer,	Powers, Me.	Swanson,
Hamilton,	Little,	Powers, Mass.	Tate,
Haugen,	Livingston,	Randell, Tex.	Tawney,
Hay,	Lloyd,	Reeder,	Taylor, Ohio
Heatwole,	Long,	Reeves,	Thomas, Iowa
Hedge,	Loudenslager,	Rhea,	Thomas, N. C.
Hemenway,	McAndrews,	Richardson, Tenn.	Thompson,
Henry, Conn.	McCall,	Rixey,	Tirrell,
Hepburn,	McCleary,	Robb,	Tompkins, Ohio
Hildebrandt,	McClellan,	Roberts,	Underwood,
Hill,	McLachlan,	Robertson, La.	Vandiver,
Hitt,	McLain,	Robinson, Ind.	Van Voorhis,
Holliday,	McRae,	Russell,	Vreeland,
Hooker,	Mahon,	Ryan,	Wadsworth,
Hopkins,	Mahoney,	Schirm,	Wagoner,
Howard,	Mann,	Scott,	Wanger,
Howell,	Marshall,	Selby,	Warner,
Hughes,	Martin,	Shackelford,	Warnock,
Hull,	Maynard,	Shallenberger,	Weeks,
Irwin,	Mercer,	Shattuc,	White,
Jackson, Kans.	Mickey,	Sheppard,	Wiley,
Jackson, Md.	Miller, Ind.	Shewalter,	Williams, Ill.
Jenkins,	Miller,	Sibley,	Williams, Miss.
Johnson,	Mondell,	Sims,	Woods,
Jones, Wash.	Moody,	Slayden,	Wright,
Joy,	Moon,	Small,	Young,
Kahn,	Morgan,	Smith, Ill.	Zenor.
Kehoe,	Morrell,	Smith, Ky.	
Kern,	Morris,	Smith, H. C.	
Ketcham,	Moss,	Smith, S. W.	
Kitchin, Claude	Mudd,		

NAYS—0.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Coombs,
Davey, La.

Lamb,
Metcalf,

Prince,

Sherman.

NOT VOTING—92.

Ball, Tex.
Bankhead,
Bell,
Bellamy,
Belmont,
Bingham,
Blackburn,
Blakeney,
Bowie,
Brantley,
Bristow,
Bull,
Burnett,
Cannon,
Cochran,
Connell,
Conry,
Cooney,
Creamer,
Davis, Fla.
Dayton,
Douglas,
Edwards,

Elliott,
Feely,
Flanagan,
Fleming,
Foerderer,
Foster, Ill.
Fowler,
Glass,
Glenn,
Gooch,
Graham,
Green, Pa.
Griffith,
Griggs,
Hanbury,
Haskins,
Henry, Miss.
Henry, Tex.
Jack,
Jett,
Jones, Va.
Kitchin, Wm. W.
Kleberg,

Knox,
Lassiter,
Lindsay,
Littlefield,
Loud,
Lovering,
McCulloch,
McDermott,
Maddox,
Meyer, La.
Minor,
Mutchler,
Naphe,
Neville,
Newlands,
Norton,
Patterson, Tenn.
Pou,
Pugsley,
Ransdell, La.
Reid,
Richardson, Ala.

Robinson, Nebr.
Rucker,
Ruppert,
Scarborough,
Shafroth,
Skiles,
Smith, Iowa
Snodgrass,
Spight,
Stevens, Minn.
Stewart, N. J.
Stewart, N. Y.
Sulzer,
Sutherland,
Talbert,
Taylor, Ala.
Thayer,
Tompkins, N. Y.
Trimble,
Wachter,
Wheeler,
Wilson,
Wooten.

So the question was decided in the affirmative.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. DOUGLAS with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. REID.

Mr. COOMBS with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. JETT.

Mr. HASKINS with Mr. LAMB.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. WILSON.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. NORTON.

On this vote:

Mr. NEVIN with Mr. NEWLANDS.

Mr. MINOR with Mr. MUTCHLER.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Mr. JACK with Mr. FEELY.

Mr. CANNON with Mr. MADDOX.

Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

Mr. BULL with Mr. BALL of Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. POU.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana.

Mr. BLAKENEY with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FOSS, Mr. DAYTON, and Mr. TATE.

AUTOMATIC COUPLERS AND SAFETY APPLIANCES.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 8560) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip

their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement.

[For text of the conference report and statement, see page 2674.]

During the reading of the conference report,

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee said: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, through the Chair, if this report has not been published in the RECORD?

Mr. WANGER. It has; oh, yes, published several days ago.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. On what page?

Mr. WANGER. It is published on page 2824 of the daily RECORD.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the conference report and statement.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to add anything by way of explanation of the agreements of the conferees to what is set forth in the report and statement. The material matter of agreement is that we withdraw from the House amendment the provision authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon application, for a stated limited period to reduce the number of cars which must have their air brakes used and operated on every train. It is needless for me to add that the House appeared to desire that change. I say appeared to do it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WANGER. I yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to ask if it is the purpose of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have debate upon this report?

Mr. WANGER. I know of no occasion for further debate. I understand that those who voted with me against the resolution offered by the gentleman from Alabama accept the conclusion reached, and make no further controversy.

Mr. ADAMSON. If it is the purpose of the gentleman to debate it, we ought to have some arrangement as to the time. I have talked with gentlemen who desire to be heard, and the gentleman from Alabama, and it is my desire—

Mr. WANGER. The gentleman from Alabama generally takes care of himself.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to debate the report, there ought to be two sides.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to my friend I desire to ask for recognition in my own right, so as to have time.

Mr. CANDLER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WANGER. Certainly.

Mr. CANDLER. Will you kindly state the effect of the agreement of the conferees as it affects the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Alabama upon which we voted the other day? What effect has the report of the conferees on that proposition?

Mr. WANGER. If the gentleman will tell me what the purpose of the gentleman from Alabama was, or if he will allow me to read what it was, I will endeavor to give him information.

Mr. CANDLER. I would be very much obliged.

Mr. WANGER. The resolution of the gentleman from Alabama was "to instruct the conferees on the part of the House to recede from that portion of amendment numbered 2 which seeks to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to reduce the minimum number of cars to be handled." That subject was not in the bill at all. But the supposition was that the intention was that the law should provide that the minimum number of cars in every train which must have their air brakes used and operated was 50 per cent, and the action of the conferees—

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WANGER (continuing). Brings about that result when the law goes into effect.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WANGER. I ask for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for the previous question.

The question was taken on ordering the previous question; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I ask for a division. I was so sure the noes were in the majority; I did not think it necessary to ask it at once.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not running that part of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. And no other part.

Mr. WANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 155, nays 88, "present" 8, not voting 100, as follows:

YEAS—155.

Adams,	Davidson,	Jackson, Md.	Powers, Mo.
Allen, Me.	Deemer,	Jenkins,	Powers, Mass.
Aplin,	Dick,	Jones, Wash.	Reader,
Babcock,	Dovener,	Kahn,	Reeves,
Ball, Del.	Draper,	Ketcham,	Roberts,
Ball, Tex.	Driscoll,	Knap,	Schirm,
Barney,	Dwight,	Kyle,	Scott,
Bartholdt,	Eddy,	Lacey,	Shattuc,
Bates,	Emerson,	Landis,	Shelden,
Beidler,	Esch,	Lawrence,	Showalter,
Bishop,	Evans,	Lessler,	Sibley,
Blackburn,	Fletcher,	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Ill.
Boreing,	Fordney,	Littauer,	Smith, Iowa
Bowersock,	Foss,	Littlefield,	Smith, H. C.
Brandegge,	Gaines, W. Va.	Long,	Smith, S. W.
Brick,	Gardner, Mich.	Loudenslager,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bromwell,	Gardner, N. J.	McCall,	Southard,
Brown,	Gibson,	McCleary,	Southwick,
Brownlow,	Gill,	McLachlan,	Sperry,
Brundidge,	Gillet, N. Y.	Mann,	Stevens, Minn.
Burk, Pa.	Gillett, Mass.	Marshall,	Storm,
Burke, S. Dak.	Graff,	Martin,	Sulloway,
Burkett,	Greene, Mass.	Mercer,	Tawney,
Burleigh,	Grosvenor,	Miller,	Taylor, Ohio
Burton,	Grow,	Minor,	Thomas, Iowa
Butler,	Hamilton,	Mondell,	Tirrell,
Calderhead,	Haugen,	Moody,	Tompkins, Ohio
Capron,	Heatwole,	Moss,	Van Voorhis,
Cassel,	Hedge,	Mudd,	Vreeland,
Conner,	Hemenway,	Needham,	Wagoner,
Coombs,	Henry, Conn.	Nevin,	Wanger,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	Olmsted,	Warner,
Cousins,	Hildebrandt,	Otjen,	Warnock,
Cromer,	Hitt,	Overstreet,	Watson,
Currier,	Holliday,	Palmer,	Weeks,
Curtis,	Howell,	Parker,	Woods,
Cushman,	Hughes,	Patterson, Pa.	Wright,
Dalzell,	Hull,	Pearre,	Young.
Darragh,	Irwin,	Perkins,	

NAYS—88.

Adamson,	Flood,	McClellan,	Selby,
Allen, Ky.	Gaines, Tenn.	McLain,	Shackleford,
Bankhead,	Gilbert,	McRae,	Shallenberger,
Bartlett,	Goldfogle,	Maddox,	Sheppard,
Bell,	Hay,	Mahoney,	Sims,
Billmeyer,	Hooker,	Mickney,	Slayden,
Bowie,	Howard,	Mickey,	Small,
Breazeale,	Jackson, Kans.	Miers, Ind.	Smith, Ky.
Broussard,	Johnson,	Moore,	Snook,
Burgess,	Jones, Va.	Mutchler,	Stark,
Burleson,	Kehoe,	Padgett,	Stephens, Tex.
Caldwell,	Kern,	Randall, Tex.	Swanson,
Candler,	Kitchin, Claude	Rhea,	Tate,
Cassingham,	Kluttz,	Richardson, Ala.	Taylor, Ala.
Clark,	Latimer,	Richardson, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton,	Lester,	Rixey,	Trimble,
Davey, La.	Lever,	Robb,	Underwood,
De Armond,	Lewis, Ga.	Robertson, La.	White,
Dinsmore,	Little,	Robinson, Ind.	Wiley,
Dougherty,	Livingston,	Rucker,	Williams, Ill.
Fitzgerald,	Lloyd,	Russell,	Williams, Miss.
Flanagan,	McAndrews,	Ryan,	Zenor.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Boutell,	Foster, Vt.	Metcalf,	Prince,
Finley,	Lamb,	Morrell,	Sherman.

NOT VOTING—100.

Acheson,	Douglas,	Jett,	Reid,
Alexander,	Edwards,	Joy,	Robinson, Nebr.
Bellamy,	Elliott,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Ruppert,
Belmont,	Feely,	Kieberg,	Scarborough,
Benton,	Fleming,	Knox,	Shafroth,
Bingham,	Foerderer,	Lassiter,	Skiles,
Blakeney,	Foster, Ill.	Lindsay,	Snodgrass,
Brantley,	Fowler,	Loud,	Sparkman,
Bristow,	Fox,	Lovering,	Spight,
Bull,	Gardner, Mass.	McCulloch,	Steele,
Burnett,	Glass,	McDermott,	Stewart, N. J.
Cannon,	Glenn,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. Y.
Cochran,	Gooch,	Meyer, La.	Sulzer,
Connell,	Gordon,	Morgan,	Sutherland,
Conry,	Graham,	Morris,	Swann,
Cooney,	Green, Pa.	Napfen,	Talbert,
Cooper, Tex.	Griffith,	Neville,	Thayer,
Corliss,	Griggs,	Newlands,	Thompson,
Cowherd,	Hanbury,	Norton,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Creamer,	Haskins,	Patterson, Tenn.	Vandiver,
Crowley,	Henry, Miss.	Payne,	Wachter,
Crumacker,	Henry, Tex.	Pierce,	Wadsworth,
Dahle,	Hill,	Pou,	Wheeler,
Davis, Fla.	Hopkins,	Pugsley,	Wilson,
Dayton,	Jack,	Ransdell, La.	Wooten.

So the previous question was ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. BELLAMY.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. BELMONT.

For this day:

Mr. JACK with Mr. FINLEY.

On this vote:

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.

Mr. CANNON with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. BULL with Mr. HENRY of Mississippi.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). The question is now on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 4, answered "present" 8, not voting 97; as follows:

YEAS—242.

Adams,	Dinsmore,	Knapp,	Powers, Me.
Adamson,	Douglas,	Kyle,	Powers, Mass.
Allen, Ky.	Dovener,	Lacey,	Randall, Tex.
Allen, Mo.	Draper,	Landis,	Reeder,
Aplin,	Driscoll,	Latimer,	Reeves,
Ball, Del.	Emerson,	Lawrence,	Rhea,
Bank, Tex.	Esch,	Lessler,	Richardson, Ala.
Bankhead,	Evans,	Lester,	Richardson, Tenn.
Barney,	Feely,	Lever,	Robb,
Bartholdt,	Fitzgerald,	Lewis, Ga.	Roberts,
Bartlett,	Flanagan,	Lewis, Pa.	Robinson, Ind.
Bates,	Fletcher,	Littauer,	Rucker,
Beidler,	Flood,	Little,	Russell,
Bell,	Foerderer,	Littlefield,	Ryan,
Benton,	Fordney,	Livingston,	Schirm,
Billmeyer,	Foss,	Lloyd,	Scott,
Bishop,	Foster, Vt.	Long,	Selby,
Blackburn,	Fowler,	Loudenslager,	Shackleford,
Boreing,	Fox,	Lovering,	Shallenberger,
Bowersock,	Gaines, Tenn.	McAndrews,	Shattuc,
Bowie,	Gaines, W. Va.	McCall,	Showalter,
Brandegge,	Gardner, Mich.	McCleary,	Slayden,
Breazeale,	Gardner, N. J.	McClellan,	Small,
Brick,	Gilbert,	McCulloch,	Smith, Ill.
Bromwell,	Gill,	McLachlan,	Smith, Iowa
Broussard,	Gillet, N. Y.	McLain,	Smith, Ky.
Brown,	Gillet, Mass.	McRae,	Smith, H. C.
Brownlow,	Glass,	Maddox,	Snook,
Bull,	Goldfogle,	Mahon,	Southard,
Burgess,	Gordon,	Mahoney,	Southwick,
Burk, Pa.	Graff,	Mann,	Sparkman,
Burke, S. Dak.	Greene, Mass.	Marshall,	Stark,
Burkett,	Grosvenor,	Martin,	Steele,
Burleigh,	Grow,	Maynard,	Stephens, Tex.
Burleson,	Hamilton,	Mercer,	Stevens, Minn.
Burton,	Haugen,	Mickey,	Storm,
Butler,	Hay,	Miers, Ind.	Sulloway,
Calderhead,	Hedge,	Miller,	Swanson,
Caldwell,	Hemenway,	Minor,	Tate,
Candler,	Henry, Tex.	Moody,	Taylor, Ohio
Capron,	Hepburn,	Moon,	Thomas, Iowa
Cassell,	Hill,	Morgan,	Thomas, N. C.
Cassingham,	Hitt,	Morrell,	Thompson,
Clark,	Holliday,	Morris,	Tirrell,
Clayton,	Hooker,	Moss,	Tompkins, Ohio
Conner,	Howard,	Mudd,	Trimble,
Coombs,	Howell,	Mutchler,	Underwood,
Cooper, Wis.	Hughes,	Needham,	Van Voorhis,
Cousins,	Hull,	Nevin,	Vreeland,
Cowherd,	Irwin,	Olmsted,	Wachter,
Cromer,	Jackson, Kans.	Otjen,	Wagner,
Crumpacker,	Jackson, Md.	Overstreet,	Wagoner,
Currier,	Jenkins,	Padgett,	Warner,
Curtis,	Jones, Va.	Palmer,	Warnock,
Cushman,	Jones, Wash.	Parker,	Watson,
Dahle,	Kahn,	Patterson, Pa.	Williams, Ill.
Dalzell,	Kehoe,	Payne,	Woods,
Darragh,	Kern,	Pearre,	Wright,
Davidson,	Ketcham,	Perkins,	Young,
Deemer,	Kitchin, Claude	Pierce,	
Dick,	Kluttz,	Pou,	

NAYS—4.

Cooney, De Armond, Sims, Zenor.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Boutell, Dayton, Lamb, Metcalf,
Prince, Rixey, Sherman, White.

NOT VOTING—97.

Acheson,	Elliott,	Knox,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Alexander,	Finley,	Lassiter,	Snodgrass,
Babcock,	Fleming,	Lindsay,	Sperry,
Bellamy,	Foster, Ill.	Loud,	Spight,
Belmont,	Gardner, Mass.	McDermott,	Stewart, N. J.
Bingham,	Gibson,	Meyer, La.	Stewart, N. Y.
Blakeney,	Glenn,	Mondell,	Sulzer,
Brantley,	Gooch,	Naphen,	Sutherland,
Bristow,	Graham,	Neville,	Swann,
Brundidge,	Green, Pa.	Newlands,	Talbert,
Burnett,	Griffith,	Norton,	Tawney,
Cannon,	Griggs,	Patterson, Tenn.	Taylor, Ala.
Cochran,	Hanbury,	Pugsley,	Thayer,
Connell,	Haskins,	Ransdell, La.	Tompkins, N. Y.
Conry,	Heatwole,	Reid,	Vandiver,
Cooper, Tex.	Henry, Conn.	Robertson, La.	Wadsworth,
Corliss,	Henry, Miss.	Robinson, Nebr.	Weeks,
Creamer,	Hildebrandt,	Ruppert,	Wheeler,
Crowley,	Hopkins,	Scarborough,	Wiley,
Davey, La.	Jack,	Shafroth,	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Fla.	Jett,	Shelden,	Wilson,
Dougherty,	Johnson,	Sheppard,	Wooten,
Dwight,	Joy,	Sibley,	
Eddy,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Skiles,	
Edwards,	Kleberg,	Smith, S. W.	

So the report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. BLAKENEY with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Mr. JOY with Mr. SULZER.

On this vote:

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BELLAMY.

Mr. CANNON with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. SHEPPARD.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider that vote and lay that motion on the table.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against that that it is clearly dilatory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it expedites the bill to the engrossing clerk, and I therefore insist on the motion to reconsider and to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is perfectly manifest that where only three gentlemen out of 250 have voted in the negative, a motion to reconsider is dilatory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But, Mr. Speaker, it has been done in this House on the unanimous vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 17288) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House, had asked a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HALE, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. TILLMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORGANIZATION OF PRIVATE CORPORATIONS IN ALASKA.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution which I wish to submit.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But there is one already on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up a conference report on Senate bill No. 6139.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois submits a conference report.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But the Chair recognized me to offer my privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But the gentleman from Illinois had taken the floor to present a conference report.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But the Chair recognized me, and I sent the resolution to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman from Tennessee has a privileged resolution, the Chair will recognize him after the gentleman from Illinois. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading, but was interrupted by Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, who said: Mr. Speaker, I want to raise the question of consideration on this report, and I want to raise that question now, before it is read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 6139, "An act to provide for the organization of private corporations in the district of Alaska" having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "one" and insert "two;" line 20, after "elected," insert "or appointed."

Page 3, line 3, after "ordinance," insert "to declare what shall be a misdemeanor and;" line 8, after "tax," insert "not to exceed \$2 each;" line 9, strike out "sixty" and insert "fifty;" line 13, after "dogs," insert "not exceeding \$2 a year on each dog;" line 17, after "tax," insert "for municipal purposes;" line 22, strike out all after "that," to and including "public," in line 23, and insert "all;" line 24, strike out "church" and "public;" line 25, strike out "worship" and insert "educational, or charitable purposes shall be exempt from taxation."

Page 4, line 2, after "tax," insert "for municipal purposes;" line 17, strike out "such" and "as;" line 20, after "be," insert "uniform and shall be."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "and."

Page 6, line 19, before "court," insert "district;" and in line 20, strike out all after "by" to and including "same," in line 21, and insert "said clerk."

Page 7, line 10, strike out "and" and insert "shall be;" and line 11, strike out "shall be" and insert "and."

Page 9, line 15, strike out "trustees" and insert "directors;" line 17, strike out second "the" and insert "its;" and line 18, strike out "are" and insert "shall be."

Page 11, line 2, strike out "stockholders" and insert "stock;" line 10, strike out "private."

Page 12, line 4, after "to," insert "cast;" line 7, after "voted," insert "a;" after "represented" insert "at such election;" and line 18, strike out "a."

Page 14, line 6, strike out "to the;" and line 7, strike out "stockholders" and insert "each stockholder."

Page 18, line 20, after "increasing," insert "or diminishing."

Page 21, line 22, strike out "just" and insert "actual;" line 23, after "character," insert "location;" and line 25, after "incurred," insert "and whether the same are secured or unsecured and the amount of each kind, and, if secured, the character and kind of security;" and

Page 22, line 1, after "salaries," insert "severally."

That the title of said act read as follows: "An act amending the civil code of Alaska, providing for the organization of private corporations, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

V. WARNER.

HENRY R. GIBSON,

F. A. McLAIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

KNUTE NELSON,

HENRY E. BURNHAM,

T. M. PATTERSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the conferees was read, as follows:

The committee on conference of the House and Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon Senate bill 6139, entitled "An act to provide for the organization of private corporations in the district of Alaska," have reached a full and complete agreement, as set forth in the accompanying report.

The greater number of amendments agreed upon by the conferees are changes in phraseology.

Section 2 is amended to require of plaintiffs in divorce actions two years' residence in Alaska, instead of one year.

The amendments to section 3 more specifically define the powers of municipalities and prescribe their limitations respecting taxation for municipal purposes.

Sections 5 to 23, inclusive, are amended to more effectually regulate private corporations and to insure greater degree of publicity.

V. WARNER.

HENRY R. GIBSON,

F. A. McLAIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee raises the question of consideration.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. We ought to consider the supply bills and not these little matters. Appropriation bills ought to be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House consider the report?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays 22, answered "present" 11, not voting 99; as follows:

YEAS—219.

Adams,	Cromer,	Hay,	McLachlan,
Adamson,	Crumpacker,	Heatwole,	Mahon,
Allen, Ky.	Currier,	Hedge,	Mahoney,
Allen, Me.	Curtis,	Hemenway,	Mann,
Aplin,	Cushman,	Henry, Tex.	Marshall,
Bail, Del.	Dahle,	Hepburn,	Martin,
Bail, Tex.	Dalzell,	Hildebrandt,	Maynard,
Bankhead,	Darragh,	Hill,	Mercer,
Barney,	Davidson,	Hitt,	Mickey,
Bartholdt,	De Armond,	Holliday,	Miller,
Bartlett,	Deemer,	Howard,	Minor,
Bates,	Dinsmore,	Howell,	Moody,
Beidler,	Dougherty,	Hughes,	Moon,
Benton,	Douglas,	Irwin,	Morgan,
Billmeyer,	Dovener,	Jackson, Kans.	Morris,
Bishop,	Draper,	Jackson, Md.	Moss,
Blackburn,	Driscoll,	Jenkins,	Mudd,
Boreing,	Dwight,	Jones, Va.	Mutchler,
Bowersock,	Emerson,	Jones, Wash.	Needham,
Bowie,	Esch,	Kahn,	Nevin,
Brandegge,	Evans,	Kehoe,	Olmsted,
Breazeale,	Feely,	Kern,	Otjen,
Brick,	Flanagan,	Ketcham,	Overstreet,
Bromwell,	Fletcher,	Kitchin, Claude	Palmer,
Brown,	Flood,	Kluttz,	Parker,
Bull,	Foerderer,	Knapp,	Patterson, Pa.
Burgess,	Fordney,	Kyle,	Payne,
Burk, Pa.	Foss,	Lacey,	Pearse,
Burke, S. Dak.	Poster, Vt.	Landis,	Powers, Mass.
Burkett,	Fowler,	Latimer,	Reeder,
Burleigh,	Fox,	Lawrence,	Reeves,
Burleson,	Gaines, W. Va.	Lessler,	Richardson, Ala.
Burton,	Gardner, Mich.	Lever,	Rixey,
Butler,	Gardner, N. J.	Lewis, Ga.	Robb,
Calderhead,	Gibson,	Lewis, Pa.	Roberts,
Caldwell,	Gilbert,	Littlefield,	Rucker,
Candler,	Gillet, N. Y.	Livingston,	Ryan,
Capron,	Gillet, Mass.	Lloyd,	Scarborough,
Cassel,	Glass,	Long,	Schirm,
Clark,	Gordon,	Loud,	Scott,
Clayton,	Graft,	Loudenslager,	Shackleford,
Cochran,	Greene, Mass.	Lovering,	Shattuc,
Conner,	Grosvenor,	McCall,	Shelden,
Coombs,	Grow,	McCleary,	Sheppard,
Corliss,	Hamilton,	McClellan,	Showalter,
Cousins,	Haugen,	McCulloch,	Sibley,

Slayden,
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, H. C.
Smith, S. W.
Smith, Wm. Alden
Southard,
Southwick,
Sperry,

Stark,
Storm,
Sulloway,
Tate,
Tawney,
Taylor, Ohio
Thomas, Iowa
Thomas, N. C.
Thompson,

Tirrell,
Tompkins, Ohio,
Trimble,
Underwood,
Vandiver,
Vreeland,
Wachter,
Wagoner,
Wanger,

Warner,
Warnock,
Watson,
White,
Williams, Ill.
Woods,
Wright,
Young.

NAYS—22.

Cassingham,
Cowherd,
Fitzgerald,
Gaines, Tenn.
Goldfogle,
Little,

McAndrews,
McRae,
Miers, Ind.
Newlands,
Padgett,
Pierce,

Randell, Tex.
Richardson, Tenn.
Robinson, Ind.
Russell,
Selby,
Sims,

Smith, Ky.
Snook,
Stephens, Tex.
Zenor.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.

Boutell,
Cannon,
Dayton,

Finley,
Johnson,
Lamb,

Metcalf,
Morrell,
Prince,

Sherman,
Stevens, Minn.

NOT VOTING—99.

Acheson,
Alexander,
Babcock,
Bell,
Bellamy,
Belmont,
Bingham,
Blakeney,
Brantley,
Bristow,
Broussard,
Brownlow,
Brundidge,
Burnett,
Connell,
Conry,
Cooney,
Cooper, Tex.
Cooper, Wis.
Creamer,
Crowley,
Davey, La.
Davis, Fla.
Dick,
Eddy,

Edwards,
Elliott,
Fleming,
Foster, Ill.
Gardner, Mass.
Gill,
Glenn,
Gooch,
Graham,
Green, Pa.
Griffith,
Griggs,
Hambury,
Haskins,
Henry, Conn.
Henry, Miss.
Hooker,
Hopkins,
Hull,
Jack,
Jett,
Joy,
Kitchin, Wm. W.
Kleberg,
Knox,

Lassiter,
Lester,
Lindsay,
Littauer,
McDermott,
McLain,
Maddox,
Meyer, La.
Mondell,
Napen,
Neville,
Norton,
Patterson, Tenn.
Perkins,
Pou,
Powers, Me.
Pugsley,
Ransdell, La.
Reid,
Rhea,
Robertson, La.
Robinson, Nebr.
Ruppert,
Shafroth,
Shallenberger,

So the House decided to consider the conference report.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. HOOKER.

Mr. CANNON with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

On this vote:

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. POU.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That the statement filed by the conference committee does not comply with the requirements of rule 29, which provides:

And there shall accompany such report a detailed statement sufficiently explicit to inform the House what effect such amendments or propositions will have upon the measure to which they relate.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that that comes too late, after the House has resolved to consider the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then I desire the gentleman from Illinois—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. WARNER. I do not yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then I make the further point that there is no quorum present in the House.

Mr. PAYNE. That is dilatory, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Within five minutes there have voted 251 members, so the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. We are under the five-minute rule now, and not the hour rule, as we were the other day. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. That is funny, but not true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report of the conferees of both Houses. The bill as amended provides for the appointment and election of election officers in municipalities in Alaska. It authorizes municipalities to levy and collect taxes there.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I insist on order. I believe I am in favor of this bill, if I can hear the gentleman's statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

Mr. WARNER. It provides that 50 per cent of the licenses collected outside of incorporated towns shall be devoted, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to educational purposes, and it authorizes the formation of corporations in the district of Alaska. If it passes to-day it will be the first legislation passing both Houses providing for publicity in relation to the formation and conduct of corporations.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman if he proposes—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, the time is too precious to waste in further debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman propose to occupy the time of this House and leave nothing to be said by the other side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HAY) there were—ayes 101, noes 81.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I demand tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly evident that the minority have not learned anything in the last two days. I demand the yeas and nays. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That is not even funny.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 136, nays 93, answered "present" 7, not voting 115; as follows:

YEAS—136.

Alexander,	Dovenor,	Irwin,	Patterson, Pa.
Allen, Me.	Draper,	Jackson, Md.	Payne,
Applin,	Driscoll,	Jones, Wash.	Pearre,
Ball, Del.	Dwight,	Kahn,	Perkins,
Bartholdt,	Emerson,	Knapp,	Powers, Me.
Bates,	Evans,	Kyle,	Reeder,
Bishop,	Fletcher,	Lacey,	Reeves,
Boring,	Foerderer,	Landis,	Roberts,
Bowersock,	Fordney,	Lawrence,	Schirm,
Brandegge,	Foss,	Lessler,	Scott,
Bromwell,	Foster, Vt.	Lewis, Pa.	Shattuc,
Brownlow,	Fowler,	Littauer,	Shelden,
Bull,	Gaines, W. Va.	Long,	Sibley,
Burk, Pa.	Gardner, Mich.	Loving,	Smith, H. C.
Burkett,	Gardner, N. J.	McCall,	Southwick,
Burleigh,	Gibson,	McLachlan,	Sperry,
Butler,	Gill,	Mahon,	Steele,
Cannon,	Gillett, Mass.	Mann,	Storm,
Capron,	Gordon,	Martin,	Sulloway,
Cassel,	Graft,	Mercer,	Taylor, Ohio,
Cochran,	Greene, Mass.	Miller,	Thomas, Iowa
Coombs,	Grosvenor,	Mondell,	Tirrell,
Corliss,	Grow,	Moody,	Tompkins, Ohio
Cousins,	Hamilton,	Morgan,	Van Voorhis,
Cramer,	Haugen,	Morris,	Vreeland,
Crumacker,	Hedge,	Moss,	Wachter,
Currier,	Hemenway,	Mudd,	Wagoner,
Curtis,	Hepburn,	Needham,	Wanger,
Cushman,	Hildebrandt,	Nevin,	Warner,
Dalzell,	Hill,	Olmsted,	Warnock,
Darragh,	Holliday,	Otjen,	Weeks,
Deemer,	Howell,	Overstreet,	Woods,
Dick,	Hughes,	Palmer,	Wright,
Douglas,	Hull,	Parker,	Young,

NAYS—93.

Adamson,	Flanagan,	McAndrews,	Ryan,
Allen, Ky.	Fleming,	McClellan,	Scarborough,
Ball, Tex.	Flood,	McCulloch,	Selby,
Bankhead,	Fox,	McLain,	Shallenberger,
Bartlett,	Gaines, Tenn.	McRae,	Sheppard,
Bell,	Goldfogle,	Maddox,	Sims,
Benton,	Gooch,	Mahoney,	Slayden,
Bowie,	Hay,	Maynard,	Smith, Ky.
Breazeale,	Henry, Tex.	Mickey,	Snodgrass,
Burgess,	Howard,	Miers, Ind.	Snook,
Burleson,	Jackson, Kans.	Moon,	Stark,
Candler,	Jones, Va.	Mutchler,	Swanson,
Cassingham,	Kehoe,	Norton,	Tate,
Clark,	Kern,	Padgett,	Taylor, Ala.
Clayton,	Kitchin, Claude	Pou,	Thomas, N. C.
Cowherd,	Klutz,	Randell, Tex.	Thompson,
Crowley,	Lamb,	Rhea,	Trimble,
Davey, La.	Latimer,	Richardson, Ala.	Vandiver,
De Armond,	Lester,	Richardson, Tenn.	Wiley,
Dinsmore,	Lever,	Rixey,	Williams, Ill.
Dougherty,	Lewis, Ga.	Robb,	Zenor.
Elliott,	Livingston,	Robinson, Ind.	
Feely,	Lloyd,	Rucker,	
Fitzgerald,		Russell,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Boutell,	Glass,	Morrell,	Sherman.
Finley,	Minor,	Prince,	

NOT VOTING—115.

Acheson,	Billmeyer,	Broussard,	Caldwell,
Adams,	Bingham,	Brown,	Connell,
Babcock,	Blackburn,	Brundidge,	Conner,
Barney,	Blakeney,	Burke, S. Dak.	Conry,
Beidler,	Brantley,	Burnett,	Cooney,
Bellamy,	Brick,	Burton,	Cooper, Tex.
Belmont,	Bristow,	Calderhead,	Cooper, Wis.

Creamer,	Hitt,
Dahle,	Hooker,
Davidson,	Hopkins,
Davis, Fla.	Jack,
Dayton,	Jenkins,
Eddy,	Jett,
Edwards,	Johnson,
Esch,	Joy,
Foster, Ill.	Ketcham,
Gardner, Mass.	Kitchin, Wm. W.
Gilbert,	Kleberg,
Gillet, N. Y.	Knox,
Glenn,	Lassiter,
Graham,	Lindsay,
Green, Pa.	Littlefield,
Griffith,	Loud,
Griggs,	Loudenslager,
Hanbury,	McCleary,
Haskins,	McDermott,
Heatwole,	Marshall,
Henry, Conn.	Metcalf,
Henry, Miss.	Meyer, La.

Naphen,	Sparkman,
Neville,	Spight,
Newlands,	Stephens, Tex.
Patterson, Tenn.	Stevens, Minn.
Pierce,	Stewart, N. J.
Powers, Mass.	Stewart, N. Y.
Pugsley,	Sulzer,
Ransdell, La.	Sutherland,
Reid,	Swann,
Robertson, La.	Talbert,
Robinson, Nebr.	Tawney,
Ruppert,	Thayer,
Shackleford,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Shafroth,	Underwood,
Showalter,	Wadsworth,
Skiles,	Watson,
Small,	Wheeler,
Smith, Ill.	White,
Smith, Iowa	Williams, Miss.
Smith, S. W.	Wilson,
Smith, Wm. Alden	Wooten.
Southard,	

So the previous question was ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. MAHON with Mr. GILBERT, until recess.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. BRUNDIDGE, on this vote.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is now on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I ask for a division.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. GILLET of New York. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 9, answered "present" 10, not voting 150; as follows:

YEAS—182.

Adamson,	Dinsmore,	Klutz,	Reeder,
Alexander,	Dougherty,	Knapp,	Richardson, Ala.
Allen, Ky.	Douglas,	Kyle,	Richardson, Tenn.
Allen, Me.	Dovenor,	Lacey,	Robb,
Applin,	Draper,	Landis,	Roberts,
Ball, Del.	Dwight,	Lawrence,	Rucker,
Ball, Tex.	Elliott,	Lessler,	Russell,
Bankhead,	Evans,	Lester,	Ryan,
Bartholdt,	Feely,	Lewis, Ga.	Scott,
Bates,	Flanagan,	Little,	Shallenberger,
Beidler,	Fordney,	Littlefield,	Shattuc,
Billmeyer,	Foster, Vt.	Livingston,	Shelden,
Bishop,	Fowler,	Lloyd,	Sheppard,
Boring,	Fox,	Long,	Showalter,
Bowie,	Gaines, Tenn.	Loving,	Sims,
Brandegge,	Gaines, W. Va.	McAndrews,	Slayden,
Brick,	Gardner, Mich.	McCall,	Small,
Bromwell,	Gardner, N. J.	McCleary,	Smith, Ill.
Burk, Pa.	Gibson,	McClellan,	Smith, Iowa
Burke, S. Dak.	Gill,	McLachlan,	Smith, H. C.
Burkett,	Gillet, N. Y.	McLain,	Smith, S. W.
Burleigh,	Gillet, Mass.	Mahoney,	Snook,
Burleson,	Goldfogle,	Mann,	Stark,
Burton,	Gooch,	Marshall,	Storm,
Calderhead,	Gordon,	Mercer,	Sulloway,
Candler,	Greene, Mass.	Mickey,	Tate,
Cannon,	Grosvenor,	Miller,	Taylor, Ala.
Capron,	Grow,	Minor,	Thomas, Iowa
Cassel,	Hamilton,	Mondell,	Thompson,
Cassingham,	Haugen,	Moon,	Tirrell,
Clark,	Hay,	Morgan,	Tompkins, Ohio
Clayton,	Hemenway,	Morris,	Trimble,
Cochran,	Henry, Tex.	Moss,	Underwood,
Conner,	Hepburn,	Mutchler,	Vandiver,
Coombs,	Hill,	Needham,	Van Voorhis,
Cousins,	Hitt,	Nevin,	Wachter,
Cowherd,	Holliday,	Norton,	Wagoner,
Cromer,	Howell,	Olmsted,	Wanger,
Crowley,	Hughes,	Otjen,	Warner,
Crumacker,	Irwin,	Padgett,	Wiley,
Currier,	Jackson, Kans.	Palmer,	Williams, Ill.
Cushman,	Jackson, Md.	Payne,	Woods,
Dalzell,	Jones, Wash.	Perkins,	Young,
Darragh,	Joy,	Pou,	Zenor.
De Armond,	Kahn,	Powers, Mass.	
Deemer,	Kitchin, Claude	Randell, Tex.	

NAYS—9.

Burgess,	McRae,	Miers, Ind.	Selby,
Fitzgerald,	Maddox,	Robinson, Ind.	Stephens, Tex.
Johnson,			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10.

Adams,	Dayton,	Lamb,	Prince.
Boutell,	Finley,	Metcalf,	
Brownlow,	Glass,	Morrell,	

NOT VOTING—150.

Acheson,	Brantley,	Cooney,	Eddy,
Babcock,	Breazeale,	Cooper, Tex.	Edwards,
Barney,	Bristow,	Cooper, Wis.	Emerson,
Bartlett,	Broussard,	Corliss,	Esch,
Bell,	Brown,	Creamer,	Fleming,
Bellamy,	Brundidge,	Curtis,	Fletcher,
Belmont,	Belmont,	Dahle,	Flood,
Benton,	Burnett,	Davey, La.	Foerderer,
Bingham,	Butler,	Davidson,	Foss,
Blackburn,	Caldwell,	Davis, Fla.	Foster, Ill.
Blakeney,	Connell,	Dick,	Gardner, Mass.
Bowersock,	Conry,	Driscoll,	Gilbert,

Glenn, Graff, Graham, Green, Pa. Griffith, Griggs, Hanbury, Haskins, Heatwole, Hedge, Henry, Conn. Henry, Miss. Hildebrandt, Hooker, Hopkins, Howard, Hull, Jack, Jenkins, Jett, Jones, Va. Kehoe, Kern, Ketcham, Kitchin, Wm. W. Kleberg,	Knox, Lassiter, Latimer, Lever, Lewis, Pa. Lindsay, Littauer, Loud, Loudenslager, McCulloch, McDermott, Mahon, Martin, Maynard, Meyer, La. Moody, Mudd, Naphen, Neville, Newlands, Overstreet, Parker, Patterson, Pa. Patterson, Tenn. Pearce, Pierce,	Powers, Me. Pugsley, Ransdell, La. Reeves, Reid, Rhea, Rixey, Robertson, La. Robinson, Nebr. Ruppert, Scarborough, Schirm, Shackleford, Shafroth, Sherman, Sibley, Skiles, Smith, Ky. Smith, Wm. Alden Snodgrass, Southard, Southwick, Sparkman, Sperry, Spight, Steele,	Stevens, Minn. Stewart, N. J. Stewart, N. Y. Sulzer, Sutherland, Swann, Swanson, Talbert, Tawney, Taylor, Ohio, Thayer, Thomas, N. C. Tompkins, N. Y. Wadsworth, Warnock, Watson, Weeks, White, Williams, Miss. Wilson, Wooten, Wright.
---	---	---	--

So the conference report was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. HANBURY with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. PIERCE.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. LESTER.

Mr. HULL with Mr. SNODGRASS.

On this vote:

Mr. MUDD with Mr. BREAZEALE.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. RHEA.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Speaker, am I recorded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. SPERRY. I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman listening when his name was called and failed to hear it?

Mr. SPERRY. I was at lunch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can not vote.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be marked "present."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. MAHON. I was not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can not be recorded on this call.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. FLOOD. I was not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can not vote.

Mr. DICK. I was not present. I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can not be recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

An act (H. R. 16069) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands therein mentioned.

PUBLIC PROPERTY IN WHITE HOUSE.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have a privileged resolution I desire to have read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee presents a privileged report, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution No. 456.

Resolved, That the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds be, and he is hereby, directed, in conformity with the act of April 17, 1900, to cause to be prepared an inventory of all the public property in or belonging to the White House, giving the cost of each article; its condition, if still in use; the final disposition of such articles as have been removed, sold, or otherwise disposed of; the prices at which each article was sold; how, by whom, and to whom each article was sold or otherwise disposed of, and the disposition of all the proceeds of such sales, including also all articles that are or were deposited there as a gift or loan or otherwise, whether public property or the property of some person, bringing such inventory and report up to this date, and transmit the same to this House as early as practicable at this session of Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee

moves to discharge the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds from the consideration of the resolution just read and to consider it in the House, and the gentleman from New York moves to lay that motion on the table. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am astonished that the gentleman from New York should let this unwarranted and improper action go on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 107, noes 70.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Tellers.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays.

[During the division Mr. GAINES of Tennessee undertook to address the House, amid cries of "Order!" and was ordered by the Speaker pro tempore to take his seat.]

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 78, answered "present" 7, not voting 127; as follows:

YEAS—139.

Alexander, Allen, Me. Aplin, Ball, Del. Barney, Bartholdt, Bates, Beidler, Bishop, Blackburn, Boreing, Boutell, Bowersock, Brandegee, Brock, Bromwell, Brown, Burk, Pa. Burke, S. Dak. Burkett, Burleigh, Burton, Butler, Caldhead, Cannon, Capron, Cassel, Conner, Coombs, Cooper, Wis. Corliss, Cromer, Crumpacker, Currier, Curtis,	Cushman, Dahle, Dalzell, Darragh, Davidson, Deemer, Dick, Douglas, Dovener, Draper, Driscoll, Dwight, Esch, Evans, Fletcher, Foerderer, Foster, Vt. Gaines, W. Va. Gardner, Mass. Gardner, Mich. Gardner, N. J. Gibson, Gill, Gillett, Mass. Graft, Greene, Mass. Grosvenor, Grow, Hamilton, Haugen, Hedge, Hemenway, Henry, Conn. Hepburn, Hildebrandt, Hitt, Holliday, Howell, Irwin, Jackson, Md. Jenkins, Jones, Wash. Joy, Kahn, Ketcham, Knapp, Kyle, Lacey, Lawrence, Lesser, Lewis, Pa. Littauer, Littlefield, Long, Lovering, McCall, McLachlan, Mann, Marshall, Martin, Mercer, Miller, Minor, Mondell, Moody, Morgan, Moss, Mudd, Needham, Oimsted,	Otjen, Overstreet, Palmer, Patterson, Pa. Payne, Perkins, Powers, Me. Powers, Mass. Reeder, Reeves, Scott, Shattuc, Showalter, Smith, Ill. Smith, Iowa Smith, S. W. Southard, Southwick, Sperry, Steele, Storm, Sulloway, Tawney, Thomas, Iowa Tirrell, Van Voorhis, Wagoner, Wanger, Warnock, Watson, Weeks, Woods, Wright, Young.
--	---	--

NAYS—78.

Adamson, Allen, Ky. Ball, Tex. Bartlett, Billmeyer, Burgess, Burleson, Candler, Cassingham, Clark, Clayton, Cooney, Cowherd, Crowley, De Armond, Dinsmore, Dougherty, Elliott, Feely, Flanagan,	Flood, Fox, Gaines, Tenn. Goldfogle, Gooch, Gordon, Howard, Jackson, Kans. Johnson, Jones, Va. Kehoe, Kitchin, Claude Kitchin, Wm. W. Kluttz, Lester, Lever, Lewis, Ga. Little, Lloyd, McClellan,	McCulloch, McLain, McRae, Madrox, Mahoney, Maynard, Mickey, Miers, Ind. Moon, Mutchler, Padgett, Pon, Randall, Tex. Rhea, Richardson, Ala. Richardson, Tenn. Rixey, Robb, Robinson, Ind. Rucker,	Russell, Ryan, Scarborough, Selby, Shallenberger, Sims, Slayden, Small, Smith, Ky. Snook, Stark, Stephens, Tex. Taylor, Ala. Thomas, N. C. Underwood, Wiley, Williams, Ill. Zenor.
--	--	---	---

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Adams, Brownlow,	Glass, Lamb,	Mahon, Metcalf,	Morrell.
---------------------	-----------------	--------------------	----------

NOT VOTING—127.

Acheson, Babcock, Bankhead, Bell, Bellamy, Belmont, Benton, Bingham, Blakeney, Bowie, Brantley, Breazeale, Bristow,	Broussard, Brundidge, Bull, Burnett, Caldwell, Cochran, Connell, Conry, Cooper, Tex. Cousins, Creamer, Davey, La. Davis, Fla.	Dayton, Eddy, Edwards, Emerson, Finley, Fitzgerald, Fleming, Fordney, Foss, Foster, Ill. Fowler, Gilbert, Gillett, N. Y.	Glenn, Graham, Green, Pa. Griffith, Griggs, Hanbury, Haskins, Hay, Heatwole, Henry, Miss. Henry, Tex. Hill, Hooker,
---	---	--	---

Hopkins,	Morris,	Shackleford,	Talbert,
Hughes,	Naphen,	Shafroth,	Tate,
Hull,	Neville,	Shelden,	Taylor, Ohio
Jack,	Nevin,	Sheppard,	Thayer,
Jett,	Newlands,	Sherman,	Thompson,
Kern,	Norton,	Sibley,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Kleberg,	Parker,	Skiles,	Tompkins, Ohio
Knox,	Patterson, Tenn.	Smith, H. C.	Trimble,
Landis,	Pearce,	Smith, Wm. Alden	Vandiver,
Lassiter,	Pierce,	Snodgrass,	Vreeland,
Latimer,	Prince,	Sparkman,	Wachter,
Lindsay,	Pugsley,	Spight,	Wadsworth,
Livingston,	Ransdell, La.	Stevens, Minn.	Warner,
Loud,	Reid,	Stewart, N. J.	Wheeler,
Loudenslager,	Roberts,	Stewart, N. Y.	White,
McAndrews,	Robinson, La.	Sulzer,	Williams, Miss.
McCleary,	Robinson, Nebr.	Sutherland,	Wilson,
McDermott,	Ruppert,	Swann,	Wooten.
Meyer, La.	Schirm,	Swanson,	

So the motion to lay the resolution of Mr. GAINES of Tennessee on the table was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. JOY with Mr. COCHRAN.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. SHAFROTH.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. MCCLEARY with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

For this day:

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. BOWIE.

On this vote:

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

IMPORTATION OF BREEDING ANIMALS.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore recognized Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16656) regulating the importation of breeding animals, and to concur in the Senate amendments thereto.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments of the Senate.

The amendments were read.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I demand a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] will take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers having reported,

The SPEAKER pro tempore said: On this question the tellers report ayes 100, noes 33. A second is ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point that that is dilatory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The last roll call, only two minutes ago, disclosed the presence of 224 members—47 more than a quorum; and not a single roll call since the opening of the session to-day has failed to disclose a quorum. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is recognized as entitled to the floor for twenty minutes in favor of the motion to suspend the rules, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as entitled to twenty minutes in opposition.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced in the House of Representatives to meet a result that grew out of a ruling by the Treasury Department upon the subject of the importation of breeding animals. After a uniform construction of the rule which had been in force for a number of years, there was a change of the law as a result of a ruling by the Treasury. A ruling was made by a collector of one of the ports of the country and was sustained by the Treasury Department, and finally by one of the courts of the country. The difference between the law as it now stands and the law that is proposed to be brought about by the enactment of this legislation I will endeavor to explain. This legislation has been asked for by the great organizations of stock growers throughout the country and the agricultural communities of the country.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the committee will permit an interruption, I would ask him this question: Would not a vote against the passage of this bill be equivalent to saying, by the man who casts that vote, that he was not in favor

of admitting high-bred animals for breeding purposes free of duty?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly it would be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I understand, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will allow me, I will state exactly what the difference is between the present law and the proposed legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. This is absolutely free trade on these articles, I understand.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is absolutely free trade on these articles. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The gentleman makes no point on that. In the Dingley bill it was provided that any animal imported specially for breeding purposes should be admitted free, and the gentleman from Illinois voted against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Not against that. It was other parts of the bill that I could not stand for. I was in favor of this particular part of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, I would like to have the gentleman explain his inconsistencies. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] By a ruling of the Department it has been held that the law, as it is to-day, applies only to the importers, the result of which is that the farmer or stock raiser can not have the benefit of this free importation unless he imports the animal himself. Now the proposition of the bill is to add the words "whether intended to be so used by the importer himself or for sale for such purpose." In the general law upon the subject there is the fullest guard against any imposition upon the Treasury by proof that must be made that the animal is pure bred and is imported for no other purpose than for breeding purposes. That is the whole of this law. The bill was passed by unanimous vote of the House. It was reported here by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means, went to the Senate, and there were put into the bill, by the Senate, two amendments, one of which is "by a citizen of the United States," so as to exclude from the privilege of free importation a citizen of any other country than our own, and the second amendment is to the effect "that the provisions of this act shall apply to all such animals as have been imported and are in quarantine," which come within the provisions of the statute.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat, I would ask him if he would tell us about how much the revenues have been in the last year, or in any year, upon this class of animals?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Almost nothing.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. How long ago was the decision made which makes this law necessary?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It was made, I think, in November.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What was the purpose of the gentleman in delaying the passage of this bill until the last hours of the last days of the session? It might have been passed two or three days ago.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman has not delayed the passage of the bill. The bill was not introduced until about two weeks ago, and in that time it has come from the Ways and Means Committee, gone to the Senate, had a unanimous vote in the Senate, as I understand, and is back here for us to concur in a couple of amendments.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I know of no objections to the bill, I will say.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to know if the gentleman from Ohio approves of the Senate amendment in reference to the importation by a citizen of the United States. If the object of the bill is to introduce and put into the hands of the farmers of the country these valuable imported animals, what difference does it make whether they are imported by a citizen of the United States or somebody else, so long as the object is to improve the breed of our stock?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think the citizens of the United States will take care of the question of importing thoroughbred stock into this country, and I would give the benefit of this exception to our own citizens as against the citizens of a foreign country. I do not consider that the amendment is one which appeals to very broad statesmanship. I would not have voted to put it in in the first place, but I shall vote to concur rather than have defeated a bill which is of so much importance and which is demanded of Congress by such a large and responsible body of men as those who petition for its passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. ROBB. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. In further answer, I will say that there is more confidence to be put, possibly, in the willingness and the assurance that our own citizens will not import diseased animals and will comply with the regulations of the Treasury than possibly might be the case if we turned open the field to all the world—not some of the world but all of the world.

Mr. ROBB. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes, I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. ROBB. Under this bill who is to determine whether these animals to be imported are hybrids or not?

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is a provision in the law, to which this is a mere amendment, that requires absolute proof of the character and pedigree of every one of these animals to be furnished by the shipper and importer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I should like to ask the gentleman, and if necessary I will ask unanimous consent to extend his time an hour—

Mr. GROSVENOR. There will be no trouble about the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Did the committee investigate far enough to determine whether this is a case in which the foreigner pays the tax or not? [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. With the gentleman from Illinois on the floor of the House, it was unnecessary to have any further investigation upon that question. [Laughter.]

If there is no further time to be used, I ask for a vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio gets through I should like to take the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to discuss the merits of this bill, but it is with a feeling of deep humiliation that I ask leave to speak to another matter that should deeply concern every patriot. It is with no partisan feeling that I refer to it, far from it; but having taken some pains to get at the facts as far as they could be ascertained on the outside, I feel impelled to call the attention of this House and of the country to the astounding fact that the mahogany sideboard presented to Mrs. Hayes while she was the mistress of the White House is now located in the Washington Brewery, the property of Mr. Joseph Frank. I saw it there myself yesterday. Sick as I was, I traced it down and identified it as well as it can be identified under the concealment maintained by those who ought to know.

I was informed yesterday by a friend where I might find it, and I called upon the very accommodating proprietor, or his representative, who seemed to be proud of his priceless acquisition. He had other articles bought at the sale, but this was the object of my search. It presents a splendid appearance, being a richly carved mahogany sideboard, perhaps 12 feet long and 3 feet deep and 9 feet high, surmounted by an eagle, carved. I found on the back the name "H. L. Frey, Cincinnati, Ohio," in two places, and this served to identify it later, as I will show.

I was informed by the young man in charge that Mr. Webb Hayes, the son of the late President, had called and recognized it as the sideboard presented to his mother, and that he had offered several hundred dollars to redeem it.

To made it further certain I sent the following telegram at my own expense.

Mr. MANN. Why didn't you use a frank?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not use franks or passes. I say I sent this dispatch:

CINCINNATI ENQUIRER, Cincinnati, Ohio:

Located in a brewery to-day sideboard recently sold from White House, said to have been given to Mrs. President Hayes when an inhabitant of the White House. On sideboard is carved these words: "H. L. Frey, Cincinnati, Ohio." See him, wiring me description, cost, and names of donors. Was informed that Webb Hayes identified it as particular article in question.

FEBRUARY 28, 1903.

JNO. W. GAINES.

To that I received this reply:

JNO. W. GAINES, Washington, D. C.:

Story is correct. See Enquirer of February 27, first column, last page.

ENQUIRER COMPANY,
J. R. MCLEAN.

I have been informed that Hon. John R. McLean, out of respect, in part, to the women of Ohio who presented Mrs. Hayes this splendid piece of mahogany, called upon its present owner and offered him several hundred dollars in vain. Mr. Frank, of the brewery, paid for it at the auction sale of the discarded White House furnishings \$85. He knew the value of his find, for I was shown there a clipping from the Post stating that Mrs. Bellamy Storer, the wife of the present minister to Austria, and Mrs. Governor William Taft, when they were young ladies and members of an "Ohio art association," presented it to Mrs. Hayes in recognition of her orders forbidding the serving of wine at the President's table.

Now, Mr. Speaker, going back to one of the old statutes, passed in 1857, we find it provided:

The steward of the President's household shall, under the direction of the President, have the charge and custody of, and be responsible for, the plate, the furniture, and other public property of the President's Mansion, and shall discharge other duties, as the President shall authorize him.

So it appears that plate is here recognized in the statute as something distinct from furniture—a distinct part of the "public property," because both words are used.

Now, I do not know whether the gentleman who took this property and sold it has done so ignorantly or negligently; but the fact is that he has sold these relics from the White House, some of them. What else he has sold we do not know. I have by resolution tried to find out, but you have laid it upon the table. My ulterior object was to have Congress immediately—to-day or tomorrow or Monday—appropriate enough money to buy all the relics that may have been sacrificed, and restore them to that hallowed place where they were placed by former Presidents and their wives, and by the distinguished daughters of some of those Presidents, and by other great and noble people who have honored the pages of our national history.

We can at least place them in the Smithsonian Institution. I would have those relics placed back, for the sake of preserving the sentiment that has made our Republic what it is and in deference to the wishes of a noble people, who love our heroes and heroines. This is not a mere question of destroying the contents of the White House, the physical contents, but it is a question of doing violence to our love of country, our patriotism, in thus permitting these old relics, which are as dear to the hearts of true patriotic American people as is their own lifeblood, to be carried within the shadow of the Capitol to the auction shop and sold from our sight forever.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, this occurrence indicates the terrible commercial spirit of the times. It evinces the lamentable decay of the proper spirit of citizenship. It is an awful revelation to us, that any man would have the temerity, unless compelled to do so, to take those relics which, no matter who put them in the White House, were White House property to a junk shop and sell them to anybody on God's green earth. My countrymen, I shudder at the thought, and so may you. We have enough ruins in our dear old land without making one of the White House and its relics.

Think for a moment of the enormity of such a thing; something never done before in the history of this country; and so particular has Congress been since 1857 in regard to these relics that it has ordered an inventory to be taken every year of the things in the White House and the things taken out of the White House, and their disposition. [Loud applause.]

The Thirty-ninth Congress, first session, on July 23, 1866, provided that—

SEC. 4. And be it further enacted, That the President is hereby authorized to appoint a steward of the President's household, who shall receive an annual salary of \$2,000, and said steward shall have the custody of the house, and shall give a bond to the United States in such sum as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem sufficient, and to be approved by him, for the faithful discharge of his trust.

There can be no question in the world, sir, about it. I have not time to read the whole article, which I hold in my hand, but I will ask leave to put it in the RECORD. It is very respectful, and gives the history of it.

A MEMBER. Read it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then I will read it if you will give me more time. I will not stop to criticize. I want the relics back "at home." I do not want to reflect here on anybody. I want to get these articles back if Congress can be induced to appropriate money to restore them.

FATE OF SIDEBOARD PRESENTED TO MRS. HAYES BY TEMPERANCE ADVOCATES.

In a Washington beer garden stands the magnificent sideboard which the young ladies of Cincinnati made and presented to Mrs. Lucy Webb Hayes when she was mistress of the White House, as a token of their approval of her action in barring wine from the menu of the Presidential dinners. The sideboard which remained wineless during the Hayes Administration is now filled with siphons, bitters, decanters, and liquor bottles. On the top shelf there is ranged a row of fine old German beer steins.

The sideboard was put up at an auction of discarded White House furniture last week, and was knocked down to the proprietor of a beer garden for \$85, which is much less than the material cost. The young ladies of Cincinnati who did the inlay work—Mrs. Bellamy Storer, wife of the present ambassador to Austria, and Mrs. William Taft, wife of the present civil governor of the Philippines, both of whom were then unmarried—were among those who contributed to the decorative work on the sideboard. After the gift was tendered Mrs. Hayes it was decided that it would be best for the President to accept on her behalf, and this was done. During several Administrations the sideboard was a conspicuous article of furniture in the White House, although it was by no means always as free from wines as it was for four years after its installation.

Soon after it was auctioned off Mr. John R. McLean, of Ohio, learned of its resting place in the beer garden. He offered \$850 for the sideboard. It was refused. Col. Webb Hayes, son of President Hayes, has been in Washington for several days. He, too, went to the beer garden, but he came away without the sideboard when the proprietor informed him that if anyone desired to preserve the traditions of the sideboard from violation he could have it for \$3,000.

Rightfully or wrongfully, a mirror was sold, a distinguished lawyer of this city told me. You know I have been sick for the last three or four days and could not be here. He told me that he bought a mirror from the White House and it had carved, as I remember, on one side Count Rochambeau's face and on another Lafayette's and on another Washington's and on another that of another distinguished person. It was sold as junk, and he bought it.

I turn here and read where Colonel Bingham, I suppose, sold candelabra:

Two candelabra, 5-foot gilded bronze, 12 branches in 2 horizontal planes of 6 each; 1 central projecting branch; tripod bases. Said to have been a present from General Patterson, of Philadelphia, to General Jackson.

I suppose this was sold as junk. This is said to have been presented, says this war report, by General Patterson, of Pennsylvania. Now, sir, I know of my own personal knowledge that the grandchildren of General Patterson, members of the D. A. R., whom I met here a few days ago, have been here in this city for a week canonizing heroes like General Patterson and Jackson, and talking about the things that they had done for you, for me, for our flag, for our country. [Applause.]

They supposed that these relics were in the White House, and yet when these children came here they found that they have been ruthlessly sold as junk. My God, think of it! Such a sentiment, Mr. Speaker, would drag angels down! A land without ruins is a land without memories, but a land without relics—what a land! What else, Mr. Speaker? I have not time to go over this whole affair. If Colonel Bingham sold this magnificent sideboard, if they have sold this mirror, if they have sold the things that General Patterson presented, my God, what did they not sell? What would they not sell? The question is, What have they sold? I do not know, neither do you.

Now, what has been done with these relics? No public report has been made. Of course a report has been made by the gentleman—the auctioneer—to the officer, Colonel Bingham, who had it in charge. We have none. We want and need it.

The following advertisement, taken from the Post, indicates that Colonel Bingham made this sale, and he should be able to enlighten Congress on all these matters:

AUCTION SALES.

Lot of furniture, chandeliers, billiard table, decoration marble and wood mantels, and a variety of other effects, lately in use at the White House, to be sold at public auction, within our rooms, 1407 G street (second floor), Wednesday, January 21, 1903, at 11 o'clock a. m. On public view Tuesday, January 20, 1903.

NOTE.—Some of the heavy or bulky articles, such as doors, sash, mantels, etc., will be sold at the Government storehouses, Fifteenth and C streets SW., on the same day, commencing at 10 o'clock a. m. Terms cash.

By order of Col. Theo. S. Bingham, United States Army.

Now, gentlemen, here is a great list in the report of the "contents" of the White House. The law requires that list to be published. The law of 1857, the law of 1866, the law of 1872, and the law of 1900. But not one single solitary thing do we find indicating that they sold anything. I can find none. I have industriously looked for it. There has been no such report made; there is no report made of the proceeds. I do not mean to say that they have been wrongfully appropriated. But no report has been made of sales. I do not know anything about the money received for these relics.

The point I want to bring to your attention, and I hope to touch the heart of the members of this House and my fellow-countrymen, is the duty that devolves upon Congress to buy these relics before they are sent out of Washington. I understand, indeed, I have been told by the best authority, that it is the intention of some person who bought many of these White House effects to furnish a White House saloon at the St. Louis Exposition and equip it with the paraphernalia that he bought at the White House of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. How much more time does the gentleman want?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want about five minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Speaker, I deny that there has been any law authorizing the sale of those "relics" of the White House. I mean "relics," not furnishings that Congress buys and puts there. There is a steward under the law appointed to take care of the relics. This is an old law. In one of the reports here I find that General Bingham says that "furniture" will have to be sold.

Are these mirrors, is this historic sideboard, are these ancient candlesticks, and is a mahogany table bought "in 1800" and carried to the White House, as this report states—my God! my countrymen, is that "furniture?" Can you for a minute treat that as "furniture?"

Mr. LAMB. Do you believe in putting the prices up so that we can not buy them?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not know what the particular prices are. But I dare say any one who has bought one of these relics would not dispose of it for anything short of an enormous sum of money, and possibly lose his own life in defending it. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the White House, as it were, is "stripped" of these things. I do not know how many of these relics have been sold. What can we presume was done with the balance? Now, I say we should take care of these relics. They should not have been sold at all, and if there is any law for it I do not know it, and have not been able to find it. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] whether he expects to close the debate with more than one speech?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; so far as I know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not care to use the balance of my time at all, unless—

Mr. GROSVENOR. Nobody is asking any time on this side; but I shall close the debate. I want to reply to some remarks that have been made.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will then reserve the balance of my time for the present.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, no; I will close the debate myself.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand, then, that the gentleman intends to close the debate?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill before the House. I think it a very meritorious measure. I think it is a bill that the Republican party should congratulate itself on bringing before the House. It is a bill in the interest, not only of the farming classes—the persons engaged in breeding animals for the promotion of the agricultural interests of this country—but in a small way—

Mr. HEPBURN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to know whether the gentleman from Alabama is in favor of this measure; and if so, by what right he has assumed to control the time in opposition and prevent those who are opposed to the bill from so expressing themselves. It looks to me as if it were a trick that ought not to be tolerated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The point comes too late.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I have some objection to some features of the bill; but I intended to vote for it as a whole. If the gentleman desires any time in opposition to the bill, I will yield. [A pause.] Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that twenty minutes may be allowed to the gentleman from Iowa for the purpose of opposing this bill, if he desires to do so.

Mr. SHATTUC. I object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the Chair put my request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa be allowed twenty minutes in opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. SHATTUC. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to yield whatever time I may have to my genial friend from Iowa. [A pause.] Well, if I can not give away my time—if I can not get the gentleman from Iowa on the floor—then I will try to continue my remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations to the Republican party for bringing this measure before the House are not only because it is in the interest of the agricultural classes of the country, but that it is doing something which a Republican Congress has not dared to do within the last eight years. It has brought in a free-trade bill. You are voting for free trade in reference to certain breeding cattle and stock. Of course it does not go very far; it does not reduce the revenues very much; it is only a very small drop in a very large bucket of a very large surplus. But in view of the fact that this Congress is rapidly coming to an end; in view of the fact that the Treasury is overburdened with millions of dollars wrung by taxation from the people of this country; in view of the fact that some of the great leaders of the Republican party in Congress now are earnestly contemplating a way by which they can loan the public funds to the banks of this country, in order that the bankers may loan back to the people of the United States their own money, wrung by taxation, charging rates of interest in order that the great banking monopolies may make blood money out of the people—in view of these facts, I think this hour is a good one for the Republican party to wake up to the fact that the people of the United States are entitled to some legislation looking toward a reduction of taxation; and although, as I say, this particular bill reduces the burden on the backs of the people only a very few thousand dollars, yet well may the Republican party be congratulated on the fact that at last, in the closing hours of Congress, they have brought in this

small pittance in the right direction, and we might hope with this light breaking on us that, if an extra session of Congress were called—if the new Congress were called together here immediately after the expiration of this Congress—with this change of heart and change of sentiment on the part of the Republican side of the House, the people might at last get justice and that we might have a bill substantially reducing taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Tennessee has misconceived the character of this bill and that his speech is not germane to the subject-matter. This is a bill about stallions and not about sideboards. It is a bill in regard to animal boars and not human bores. [Laughter.] It is a bill that relates to rams and not corkscrews. It relates to male animals of fine breed and has nothing to do with bar fixtures that I know anything about. I do not believe the stories that are being circulated in regard to the looting of the White House.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman to say that this bill limits free importation to male animals?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No. We usually import all sorts of fine animals, but I would not talk about the other sex. [Laughter.]

I have the utmost confidence in the President of the United States. I believe he is a gentleman of sterling honesty and absolute purity of personal character; and the charges that have been made in regard to this matter are charges directly and necessarily against him, for it is impossible to believe that any such conditions of things could have taken place without his personal knowledge. I therefore pay no attention to those stories which have been coming through the newspapers. I should like to know, however, incidentally to the transaction, why the Woman's Christian Temperance Union was presenting Mrs. Hayes with bar fixtures. [Laughter.] I have heard a good deal about that. I had a very pleasant and intimate acquaintance with the White House family during the Administration of President Hayes, and I never saw any bar fixtures there nor, indeed, anything that would fit into a bar. I never have believed any of these stories.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], who is not in his seat, stated that he had been personally down and seen the sideboard, and he designated the place and the city. It is here in this city.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman kindly give me the name of the place?

Mr. PADGETT. It is at a brewery. The gentleman from Tennessee named it here. That brewery is situated in the city of Washington. Now, upon that statement, does the gentleman still say that he does not believe that the sideboard has been sold and that it is at that place?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, I have no doubt the brewery may have bought a sideboard. There are a great many sideboards.

Mr. PADGETT. But this one was sold by the officers at the White House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No doubt.

Mr. PADGETT. And it was the one which was presented to Mrs. Hayes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Ah, there comes the point. I do not believe that.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, if the gentleman will not believe the personal testimony, is he not willing to have it investigated?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] It comes under the rule of de minimis. I would like to have the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] pursue his investigations, because it seems to be very attractive to him, but I do not want to have anything to do with it.

Mr. PADGETT. It seems that the gentleman from Ohio is unwilling to have an official investigation of it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. And contents himself to say that he will not believe.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is exactly where I stand. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. I presume that the gentleman thinks it is much safer to say "I will not believe" than to take the results of an investigation.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is a presumption of the gentleman, but it has no effect upon me.

Mr. PADGETT. I notice that the opinion of the gentleman can not be affected by anything that will expose his political party.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am profoundly affected now. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I am profoundly affected by a statesman who wants to follow back along the historical line of a lot of second-hand furniture to see if some of it has got misplaced. It is

statesmanship of the most profound character! I do not believe that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union ever presented bar fixtures to Mrs. Hayes either. Mrs. Hayes was a temperance woman and did not drink and did not furnish anything to drink while she was in the White House.

Mr. PADGETT. A sideboard is not a bar fixture.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What is it?

Mr. PADGETT. It is a dining room piece of furniture; but it is now lodged in a barroom.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It seems to fit in now. There is nothing in the story; but what has that got to do with a bill that relates to bulls and rams and boars? As to the bores, there is no doubt about them.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Tradition says that many years ago, when Madison was President, the east room of the White House being then in an unfinished condition, the mistress of the White House used to cause the weekly washing to be hung in the east room. My God, what has become of the clothesline! [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Speaker, you see how widely these things distribute themselves when you get onto points of this character.

Great God, on what a slender thread hang everlasting things—

On a clothesline. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a simple proposition that has always been a part of the policy of the Republican party. I want to reply to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who seems to have got into confusion about this question of free trade and taxation. I am glad to see that he has got back into the Democratic party again since his speech in opposition to any changes in the tariff law that he made some weeks ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I never made any speech against changing the tariff. I have always been in favor of a reduction of the tariff.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Have you?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now and always.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, this proposition is in conformity with the whole policy of the Republican party. We do not tax any article that is produced in a foreign country and which we do not produce in this country, unless it is a luxury. Now, we believe that this fine stock may be found in Arabia, in Egypt, in France, and in other countries of the world, such stock as we are not producing in this country, and therefore we import it free of duty into this country. So that this is exactly in keeping with the Republican policy all along the line. It has been our policy, and the principle is now in the law of the country, and the bill which I am now in favor of and which the gentleman is in favor of only supplies a defect in the wording of the original proposition in the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I desire a vote upon the question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and taking the bill H. R. 16656 from the Speaker's table and concurring in the amendments of the Senate to the same.

The question being taken,

Mr. UNDERWOOD demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nay 1, answered "present" 3, not voting 113; as follows:

YEAS—234.

Acheson,	Caldwell,	Esch,	Hitt,
Adamson,	Candler,	Evans,	Holliday,
Alexander,	Cannon,	Feely,	Howard,
Allen, Ky.	Capron,	Fitzgerald,	Howell,
Babcock,	Cassel,	Flanagan,	Hughes,
Ball, Del.	Cassingham,	Fleming,	Hull,
Ball, Tex.	Clark,	Fletcher,	Irwin,
Bankhead,	Clayton,	Flood,	Jackson, Kans.
Barney,	Conner,	Fordney,	Jackson, Md.
Bartlett,	Coombs,	Foster, Vt.	Jenkins,
Bates,	Corliss,	Gaines, Tenn.	Jones, Va.
Beidler,	Cousins,	Gaines, W. Va.	Jones, Wash.
Billmeyer,	Cowherd,	Gardner, Mass.	Joy,
Bishop,	Cromer,	Gardner, Mich.	Kahn,
Boreing,	Crowley,	Gardner, N. J.	Kehoe,
Boutell,	Crumpacker,	Gibson,	Kern,
Bowersock,	Currier,	Gillet, N. Y.	Kitchin, Claude.
Bowie,	Cushman,	Glass,	Kitchin, Wm. W.
Brandegge,	Dahle,	Goldfogle,	Kluttz,
Breazeale,	Dalzell,	Gordon,	Knapp,
Brick,	Darragh,	Graff,	Kyle,
Bromwell,	Davey, La.	Greene, Mass.	Lacey,
Broussard,	Davidson,	Griggs,	Lamb,
Brown,	De Armond,	Grosvenor,	Landis,
Brundidge,	Deemer,	Grow,	Latimer,
Bull,	Dick,	Hamilton,	Lawrence,
Burgess,	Dougherty,	Haugen,	Lester,
Burke, S. Dak.	Douglas,	Hay,	Lewis, Ga.
Burleigh,	Dovener,	Heatwole,	Lewis, Pa.
Burleson,	Draper,	Hedge,	Little,
Burton,	Driscoll,	Hemenway,	Littlefield,
Butler,	Dwight,	Henry, Tex.	Livingston,
Calderhead,	Emerson,	Hill,	Lloyd,

Long,	Needham,	Ryan,	Stevens, Minn.
Loud,	Neville,	Scarborough,	Storm,
Lovering,	Nevin,	Schirm,	Sulloway,
McAndrews,	Newlands,	Scott,	Swanson,
McCall,	Norton,	Selby,	Thomas, Iowa
McClellan,	Olmsted,	Shackelford,	Thomas, N. C.
McCulloch,	Overstreet,	Shallenberger,	Thompson,
McLachlan,	Padgett,	Shattuc,	Tirrell,
McLain,	Palmer,	Sheppard,	Tompkins, Ohio
McRae,	Patterson, Pa.	Showalter,	Trimble,
Maddox,	Patterson, Tenn.	Sims,	Underwood,
Mahoney,	Payne,	Slayden,	Van Voorhis,
Mann,	Pearre,	Smith, Ill.	Vreeland,
Marshall,	Pou,	Smith, Iowa	Wagoner,
Martin,	Powers, Mass.	Smith, Ky.	Wanger,
Maynard,	Randell, Tex.	Smith, H. C.	Warner,
Mercer,	Reeves,	Smith, S. W.	Warnock,
Mickey,	Rhea,	Smith, Wm. Alden	Watson,
Miers, Ind.	Richardson, Ala.	Snodgrass,	Wiley,
Miller,	Rixey,	Snook,	Williams, Ill.
Mondell,	Robb,	Southard,	Woods,
Moody,	Roberts,	Southwick,	Wright,
Moon,	Robinson, Ind.	Sperry,	Young,
Morgan,	Robinson, Nebr.	Stark,	Zenor.
Morrell,	Rucker,	Steele,	
Moss,	Russell,	Stephens, Tex.	

NAY—1.

Hepburn.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Brownlow,	Mahon,	Prince.
-----------	--------	---------

NOT VOTING—113.

Adams,	Elliott,	Lessler,	Sibley,
Allen, Me.	Finley,	Lever,	Skiles,
Aplin,	Foerderer,	Lindsay,	Small,
Bartholdt,	Foss,	Littauer,	Sparkman,
Bell,	Foster, Ill.	Loudenslager,	Spight,
Bellamy,	Fowler,	McCleary,	Stewart, N. J.
Belmont,	Fox,	McDermott,	Stewart, N. Y.
Benton,	Gilbert,	Metcalf,	Sulzer,
Bingham,	Gill,	Meyer, La.	Sutherland,
Blackburn,	Gillett, Mass.	Minor,	Swann,
Blakeney,	Glenn,	Morris,	Talbert,
Brantley,	Gooch,	Mudd,	Tate,
Bristow,	Graham,	Mutchler,	Tawney,
Burk, Pa.	Green, Pa.	Naphe,	Taylor, Ohio
Burkett,	Griffith,	Otjen,	Taylor, Ala.
Burnett,	Hanbury,	Parker,	Thayer,
Cochran,	Haskins,	Perkins,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	Pierce,	Vandiver,
Conry,	Henry, Miss.	Powers, Me.	Wachter,
Cooney,	Hildebrandt,	Pugsley,	Wadsworth,
Cooper, Tex.	Hooker,	Ransdell, La.	Weeks,
Cooper, Wis.	Hopkins,	Reeder,	Wheeler,
Creamer,	Jack,	Reid,	White,
Curtis,	Jett,	Richardson, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Fla.	Johnson,	Robertson, La.	Wilson,
Dayton,	Ketcham,	Ruppert,	Wooten.
Dinsmore,	Kleberg,	Shafroth,	
Eddy,	Knox,	Shelden,	
Edwards,	Lassiter,	Sherman,	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. CURTIS with Mr. BURGESS.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut with Mr. FOX.

Mr. GILL with Mr. JACKSON of Kansas.

On this vote:

Mr. OTJEN with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. GILLET with Massachusetts with Mr. TATE.

Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. SHAFROTH.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. SMALL.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3560), an act to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1893, and amended April 1, 1896.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 16775) establishing United States courts at Duncan, Maryetta, and Comanche, Ind. T.

UTICA, N. Y., A PORT OF DELIVERY.

Mr. PAYNE, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 15924) constituting Utica, N. Y., a port of delivery; which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

JUNEAU, ALASKA, A CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 17330) providing for the removal of the port of entry in the customs collection district of Alaska from Sitka, Alaska, to Juneau, Alaska; which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the following bill:

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5437) to authorize the settlement of the accounts of officers of the Army.

Be it enacted, etc., That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, directed, in the settlement of the accounts of disbursing officers of the War Department, arising between the 21st day of April, 1898, from which date war with Spain is declared to have existed, and the 8th day of July, 1901, inclusive, the date on which the last organization of the Volunteer Army was mustered out of the service of the United States, to allow such credits for payments and for losses of funds, vouchers, and property as may be recommended under authority of the Secretary of War by the heads of the military bureaus to which such accounts respectively pertain.

SEC. 2. That the accounts of military officers, whether of the line or staff, for Government property charged to them, shall be closed by the proper accounting officers whenever in the judgment of the Secretary of War it will be for the interest of the United States to do so: *Provided*, That such accounts originated subsequent to April 21, 1898, and prior to the 8th day of July, 1901: *Provided further*, That no settlement shall be made by the officers of the Treasury under this act of the accounts of any officer whose combined responsibility for public money and Government property shall exceed the sum of \$5,000, and only of such officers of the Army in whose accounts there is no apparent fraud against the United States: *And provided further*, That this act shall remain in force for two years from and after its passage, and no longer.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

Mr. HAY. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered, to which request the gentleman from Virginia objects. The Chair will appoint to tell the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

The House divided; and tellers reported—ayes 144, noes 0.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAY. I presume I have twenty minutes.

Mr. HULL. I will yield the gentleman twenty minutes if he desires it now, reserving twenty minutes if necessary.

Mr. HAY. I suggest that the gentleman had better explain the bill.

Mr. HULL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to giving an explanation. The bill simply provides for permitting the War Department to adjust the accounts of officers of the Army. This includes volunteer quartermasters, commissaries, and paymasters whose accounts are held up in the Treasury Department on technical grounds. No cases of fraud are alleged—no doubts as to the honesty of the officers that are to be considered under the provisions of this bill. The amount is limited and small in each case. There are volunteer quartermasters, commissaries, and paymasters and disbursing officers whose accounts the War Department is unable to adjust because of a ruling of the Treasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What are the technical objections that the Treasury Department urges?

Mr. HULL. The objections are various, under the different bureaus. If anything is destroyed by fire, it does not relieve the officer. If anything has been stolen, it does not relieve the officer. If he should pay off a regiment at San Francisco, and it is afterwards found there is a small discrepancy in the accounts, the paymaster is liable for it. He can not delay the paying off of the troops and wait and get the Comptroller's decisions on these matters. The Dockery bill allows, in time of peace, the disbursing officers to hold up accounts and get an opinion of the Comptroller before paying. If this man's regiment is being paid off at San Francisco and a question comes up affecting a few hundred dollars which he has to refer to the War Department, he is compelled to go on with the paying off of his regiment, as he can not hold the regiment until he can get an opinion from the Comptroller. Decisions have been had from the Comptroller's office on 150 different questions, but it is impossible to have an opinion which would apply to the whole, as they follow varying lines.

And this follows just the same line as the cases that came to Congress following the close of the civil war, and it will be the same case with the paymasters and other officers in any other war that we may have in the future. There is not a paymaster that

is not affected by it. Yet there is no charge of wrongdoing by any of these officers.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. How does this affect the pay of the civil assistant surgeons of the Army?

Mr. HULL. It does not involve the assistant surgeon. He is under contract. If there is any error in his accounts it affects the paymaster who paid him, for the assistant surgeon is out of the service.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. As I understand the law, the surgeon is entitled to the rank of captain, and if he got paid as an assistant surgeon, what as to his claim against the Government?

Mr. HULL. It will not affect that at all. This affects the paymaster. I have here a brief statement from some of the disbursing officers which I will include in my remarks:

The sole intention of S. 5437 is to relieve disbursing officers of disallowances in expenditures of public moneys made:

In good faith.

Under orders of competent superior authority.

Under a fair interpretation of legislation that was new between April 21, 1898, and July 8, 1901, but which, long subsequent to payments, was differently construed by the Comptroller.

Through lack of proper facilities in the field for the necessary orderly calculation of amounts due on pay accounts of officers, discharged men, and muster rolls.

Through misleading and erroneous statements on accounts of volunteer officers and men, which could not be corrected, and omissions thereon which could not be supplied by responsible officers prior to muster out.

Because of the unusual pressure and confusion of business, both in the field and in offices, attendant upon a state of war.

Because of the impracticability of paymasters obtaining accurate travel pay distances for settlement of travel pay allowances of discharged officers and enlisted men, without delaying payments and entailing hardships.

Because the separation from regimental and company records of many organizations which were precipitately embarked for hostilities in Cuba required paymasters to either decline payment or accept for their guidance the statements and certificates of officers, made in good faith, but which were subsequently shown to be erroneous.

So far as this office is concerned, it is not the intention of the Paymaster-General to recommend removal of suspensions under this act in any case where the paymaster had before him information for correct payments, or where such relief is not considered just and reasonable.

PAYMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE, February 11, 1903.

WAR DEPARTMENT, QUARTERMASTER-GENERAL'S OFFICE. Washington, February 11, 1903.

The class of cases affected by Senate bill No. 5437, so far as relates to the Quartermaster's Department, are for losses of public funds by theft or fire, or while in transit; loss of vouchers or other papers necessary for the completion of an account; overpayments to creditors which can not be recovered, and made in good faith by the disbursing officer; irregular payments made under orders of superior authority and contrary to a subsequent interpretation of law or regulations. It is not intended that any cases shall receive relief under this act where the disbursing officer shall have been guilty of negligence or carelessness in handling or accounting for public funds.

CHAUNCEY B. BAKER,
Captain and Quartermaster, United States Army.

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE COMMISSARY-GENERAL, Washington, February 11, 1903.

SIR: The class of accounts in this office that can be adjusted under S. 5437 includes losses by theft, fire, storm, and flood.

There are also cases where officers, although not at fault, are prevented by unavoidable conditions from furnishing the necessary documentary evidence to relieve them from responsibility.

Very respectfully,

J. F. WESTON,
Commissary-General.

The CHAIRMAN OF THE MILITARY COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The object of the measure is to provide for little accounts of this kind which have accumulated in the payment of the different regiments, and which have arisen from loss of supplies by fire or theft.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will try to acquaint members on this side of the House with the features of this bill.

The Committee on Military Affairs—

I am reading from the report—

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5437) to authorize the settlement of the accounts of officers of the Army, report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

This act passed the Senate on February 7, 1903. As a very full report was made on this act in the Senate by Senator COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, said report is herewith submitted and made a part hereof.

The passage of this bill has been recommended by the Commissary-General, the Paymaster-General, the Surgeon-General, the Chief of Engineers, the Chief of Ordnance, the Chief of the Signal Corps, and the Secretary of War.

This bill is almost identical in language—

says Senator COCKRELL in his report—

with the act of June 23, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the settlement of accounts of officers of the Army and Navy," the difference being that the bill under consideration refers only to the Army and does not embrace the Navy. It seems simply a measure of justice and right, and your committee

therefore recommend the passage of the bill with the amendment recommended by the Commissary-General.

The bill was accordingly passed.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Has the gentleman read the "very full report" which the House committee states was made in the Senate?

Mr. HAY. Yes, sir. This is our report, supplemented by the Senate report.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. What do the Quartermaster-General and the Paymaster-General have to say about the bill?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to read the letter of the Commissary-General, which I will proceed to do:

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE COMMISSARY-GENERAL OF SUBSISTENCE, Washington, May 5, 1902.

Respectfully returned (through the Paymaster-General of the Army) to the honorable the Secretary of War.

This bill, though limited to disbursing officers of the War Department, has evidently been drawn on the lines of the act entitled "An act to authorize the settlement of the accounts of officers of the Army and Navy," approved June 23, 1870 (16 Stat. L., 166), which was limited in duration to two years, but which was extended for an additional two years by act of June 7, 1872 (17 Stat. L., 262), and for a further term of two years by act of June 18, 1874 (18 Stat. L., 79). It is to be observed, however, that it makes relief by the accounting officers mandatory when recommended by the heads of military bureaus of the War Department in cases covered by the bill.

In order to make perspicuous the meaning of the second proviso of the second section of the bill, I recommend that in place of the word "which," in the tenth line of that section, there be inserted the words "of the accounts of any officer whose combined responsibility for public money and Government property."

With this amendment I recommend the bill for favorable consideration.

J. F. WESTON, Commissary-General.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SMITH], in order that he may read the letter of the Acting Paymaster-General.

[Mr. SMITH of Kentucky addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 0, answered "present" 5, not voting 122; as follows:

YEAS—224.

Acheson,	Douglas,	Knapp,	Rhea,
Adams,	Dovener,	Knox,	Richardson, Ala.
Alexander,	Draper,	Kyle,	Richardson, Tenn.
Allen, Ky.	Driscoll,	Lacey,	Rixey,
Allen, Me.	Dwight,	Landis,	Robb,
Aplin,	Eddy,	Latimer,	Roberts,
Babcock,	Elliott,	Lessler,	Robinson, Ind.
Ball, Del.	Emerson,	Lester,	Rucker,
Ball, Tex.	Esch,	Lever,	Russell,
Barney,	Feely,	Lewis, Pa.	Ryan,
Bartholdt,	Fitzgerald,	Little,	Scarborough,
Bates,	Flanagan,	Littlefield,	Scott,
Billmeyer,	Fletcher,	Livingston,	Selby,
Bishop,	Flood,	Lloyd,	Shattuc,
Blackburn,	Fordney,	Long,	Sheppard,
Boring,	Foss,	Loudenslager,	Showalter,
Boutell,	Foster, Vt.	Lovering,	Sims,
Bowersock,	Gaines, W. Va.	McAndrews,	Slayden,
Brandegge,	Gardner, Mass.	McCall,	Small,
Broadzale,	Gardner, Mich.	McClellan,	Smith, Ill.
Brick,	Gardner, N. J.	McCulloch,	Smith, Iowa
Broussard,	Gibson,	McLachlan,	Smith, Ky.
Brown,	Gillet, N. Y.	McRae,	Smith, H. C.
Brundidge,	Glass,	Maddox,	Smith, S. W.
Burgess,	Goldfogle,	Mann,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Burke, S. Dak.	Gordon,	Marshall,	Snodgrass,
Burkett,	Graft,	Martin,	Snook,
Burleigh,	Greene, Mass.	Maynard,	Southwick,
Burleson,	Griggs,	Mercer,	Sperry,
Burton,	Grosvenor,	Mickey,	Stark,
Butler,	Hamilton,	Miers, Ind.	Steele,
Calderhead,	Haugen,	Minor,	Stevens, Minn.
Caldwell,	Hay,	Mondell,	Sulloway,
Candler,	Hedge,	Moody,	Tawney,
Cannon,	Hemenway,	Moon,	Taylor, Ohio,
Capron,	Hepburn,	Morgan,	Thomas, Iowa
Cassel,	Hill,	Morris,	Thomas, N. C.
Cassingham,	Hitt,	Moss,	Thompson,
Clark,	Holliday,	Mutchler,	Tirrell,
Clayton,	Howard,	Needham,	Tompkins, Ohio
Conner,	Howell,	Neville,	Trimble,
Coombs,	Hughes,	Nevin,	Underwood,
Cooper, Wis.	Hull,	Olmsted,	Vandiver,
Cornish,	Irwin,	Overstreet,	Van Voorhis,
Cowherd,	Jackson, Kans.	Padgett,	Wagoner,
Cromer,	Jackson, Md.	Palmer,	Wanger,
Crowley,	Jenkins,	Parker,	Warner,
Currier,	Jones, Va.	Patterson, Pa.	Warnock,
Cushman,	Jones, Wash.	Patterson, Tenn.	Weeks,
Dalzell,	Kahn,	Payne,	Wiley,
Darragh,	Kehoe,	Pearre,	Williams, Ill.
Davey, La.	Kern,	Perkins,	Woods,
Davis, Fla.	Ketcham,	Pou,	Wright,
Deemer,	Kitchin, Claude	Powers, Mass.	Young,
Dick,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Randell, Tex.	Zenor.
Dinsmore,	Kluttz,	Reeves,	

NAYS—0.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Bartlett,	Prince,	Shackleford,	Sherman.
Lamb,			

NOT VOTING—122.

Adams,	Edwards,	Kleberg,	Shafroth,
Bankhead,	Evans,	Lassiter,	Shallenberger,
Beidler,	Finley,	Lawrence,	Shelden,
Bell,	Fleming,	Lewis, Ga.	Sibley,
Bellamy,	Foerderer,	Lindsay,	Skiles,
Belmont,	Foster, Ill.	Littauer,	Southard,
Benton,	Fowler,	Loud,	Sparkman,
Bingham,	Fox,	McCleary,	Spight,
Blakeney,	Gaines, Tenn.	McDermott,	Stephens, Tex.
Bowie,	Gilbert,	McLain,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brantley,	Gill,	Mahon,	Storm,
Bristow,	Gillett, Mass.	Mahoney,	Sutherland,
Bromwell,	Glenn,	Metcalf,	Swann,
Brownlow,	Gooch,	Meyer, La.	Swanson,
Bull,	Graham,	Miller,	Talbert,
Burk, Pa.	Green, Pa.	Morrell,	Tate,
Burnett,	Griffith,	Mudd,	Taylor, Ala.
Cochran,	Grow,	Naphe,	Thayer,
Connell,	Hanbury,	Newlands,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Conry,	Haskins,	Norton,	Tracy,
Cooney,	Heatwole,	Otjen,	Wachter,
Cooper, Tex.	Henry, Conn.	Pierce,	Wadsworth,
Cousins,	Henry, Miss.	Powers, Me.	Wheeler,
Creamer,	Henry, Tex.	Pugsley,	White,
Crumpacker,	Hildebrandt,	Ransdell, La.	Williams, Miss.
Curtis,	Hooker,	Reider,	Wilson,
Dahle,	Hopkins,	Robertson, La.	Wooten.
Davidson,	Jack,	Ruppert,	
Dayton,	Jett,		
De Armond,	Johnson,		
Dougherty,	Joy,		

So (two-thirds voting in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GILL with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. REEDER with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. CASSINGHAM.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

For the balance of day:

Mr. GROW with Mr. BARTLETT.

On this vote:

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. SHALLENBERGER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes.

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

An act (H. R. 17046) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 17046, the fortifications appropriation bill, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

During the reading,

Mr. UNDERWOOD said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise the question of consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point that that can not be done under the rule, and the further point that it is obviously dilatory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Under what rule?

Mr. PAYNE. Under the special rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is this a House bill with Senate amendments?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood it was a conference report. I misunderstood what it was.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the point of order and the Clerk will proceed.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House disagree to said amendments en bloc and ask a conference with the Senate?

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD demanded a division.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 1, answered "present" 8, not voting 122; as follows:

YEAS—220.

Acheson,	Draper,	Lacey,	Richardson, Tenn.
Adamson,	Driscoll,	Landis,	Rixey,
Alexander,	Dwight,	Latimer,	Robb,
Allen, Ky.	Eddy,	Lessler,	Robinson, Ind.
Allen, Me.	Emerson,	Lester,	Robinson, Nebr.
Applin,	Esch,	Lever,	Rucker,
Ball, Del.	Evans,	Lewis, Pa.	Russell,
Ball, Tex.	Feely,	Littauer,	Scarborough,
Bankhead,	Fitzgerald,	Little,	Schirm,
Barney,	Fletcher,	Littlefield,	Scott,
Bates,	Flood,	Livingston,	Selby,
Billmeyer,	Foster, Vt.	Lloyd,	Shallenberger,
Bishop,	Fowler,	Long,	Sheppard,
Blackburn,	Gaines, W. Va.	Loudenslager,	Showalter,
Boreing,	Gardner, Mass.	Lovering,	Sims,
Boutell,	Gardner, Mich.	McAndrews,	Skiles,
Bowersock,	Gardner, N. J.	McCleary,	Slayden,
Brandegge,	Gibson,	McClellan,	Small,
Brick,	Gillett, N. Y.	McLachlan,	Smith, Iowa
Bromwell,	Glass,	McRae,	Smith, Ky.
Broussard,	Goldfogle,	Maddox,	Smith, H. C.
Brown,	Gordon,	Mahoney,	Snodgrass,
Burgess,	Graff,	Mann,	Snook,
Burke, S. Dak.	Greene, Mass.	Marshall,	Southard,
Burkett,	Griggs,	Maynard,	Sparkman,
Burleigh,	Grosvenor,	Mercer,	Sperry,
Burleson,	Hamilton,	Mickey,	Stark,
Burton,	Haugen,	Miers, Ind.	Steele,
Butler,	Hay,	Miller,	Stevens, Minn.
Candler,	Hedge,	Minor,	Sulloway,
Capron,	Hemenway,	Moody,	Swanson,
Cassel,	Henry, Tex.	Moon,	Tate,
Cassingham,	Hepburn,	Morgan,	Tawney,
Clark,	Hitt,	Morrell,	Thomas, Iowa
Clayton,	Holliday,	Moss,	Thomas, N. C.
Conner,	Hopkins,	Mutchler,	Thompson,
Coombs,	Howard,	Needham,	Tirrell,
Cooper, Wis.	Howell,	Neville,	Tompkins, Ohio
Corliss,	Hughes,	Nevin,	Trimble,
Cousins,	Hull,	Olmsted,	Underwood,
Cromer,	Irwin,	Otjen,	Vandiver,
Crowley,	Jackson, Kans.	Overstreet,	Van Voorhis,
Currer,	Jackson, Md.	Padgett,	Wagoner,
Cushman,	Jenkins,	Palmer,	Wanger,
Dalzell,	Jones, Va.	Parker,	Warner,
Darragh,	Jones, Wash.	Patterson, Pa.	Warnock,
Davey, La.	Kahn,	Patterson, Tenn.	Watson,
Davidson,	Kehoe,	Payne,	Weeks,
Davis, Fla.	Kern,	Pearre,	Wiley,
De Armond,	Ketcham,	Perkins,	Williams, Ill.
Deemer,	Kitchin, Claude	Pou,	Williams, Miss.
Dick,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Randell, Tex.	Woods,
Dinsmore,	Kluttz,	Reeder,	Wright,
Douglas,	Knappe,	Rhea,	Young,
Dovenor,	Kyle,	Richardson, Ala.	Zenor.

NAYS—1.

Flanagan.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Bartlett,	Breazeale,	Joy,	Shackleford,
Bowie,	Cowherd,	Lamb,	Sherman.

NOT VOTING—122.

Adams,	Edwards,	Knox,	Ryan,
Babcock,	Elliott,	Lassiter,	Shafroth,
Bartholdt,	Finley,	Lawrence,	Shattuc,
Beidler,	Fleming,	Lewis, Ga.	Shelden,
Bell,	Foerderer,	Lindsay,	Sibley,
Bellamy,	Fordney,	Loud,	Smith, Ill.
Belmont,	Foss,	McCall,	Smith, S. W.
Benton,	Foster, Ill.	McCulloch,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bingham,	Fox,	McDermott,	Southwick,
Blakeney,	Gaines, Tenn.	McLain,	Spight,
Bowie,	Gilbert,	Mahon,	Stephens, Tex.
Brantley,	Gill,	Martin,	Stewart, N. J.
Bristow,	Gillett, Mass.	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brownlow,	Glenn,	Meyer, La.	Storm,
Brundidge,	Gooch,	Mondell,	Sulzer,
Bull,	Graham,	Morris,	Sutherland,
Burk, Pa.	Green, Pa.	Mudd,	Swann,
Burnett,	Griffith,	Naphe,	Talbert,
Calderhead,	Grow,	Newlands,	Taylor, Ohio
Caldwell,	Cannon,	Norton,	Taylor, Ala.
Cann,	Haskins,	Pierce,	Thayer,
Cochran,	Heatwole,	Powers, Me.	Tompkins, N. Y.
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	Powers, Mass.	Vreeland,
Conry,	Henry, Miss.	Prince,	Wachter,
Cooney,	Hildebrandt,	Pugsley,	Wadsworth,
Cooper, Tex.	Hill,	Ransdell, La.	Wheeler,
Creamer,	Hooker,	Reeves,	White,
Crumpacker,	Jack,	Reid,	Wilson,
Curtis,	Jett,	Robertson, La.	Wooten.
Dahle,	Johnson,	Ruppert,	
Dayton,	Kleberg,		
Dougherty,			

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye." The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROSVENOR). Was the gentleman in the room when his name was called, and listening?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I was not in the Hall. I was called out by some of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman can not vote.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

On this vote:

Mr. CANNON with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. SWANN.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts with Mr. McLAIN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER (having resumed the chair) announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. HEMENWAY, Mr. LITTAUER, and Mr. MCRAE.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles: On February 27, 1903:

H. R. 16. An act to provide for the erection at Washington, D. C., of statutes to the memory of Brig. Gen. Count Pulaski and Maj. Gen. Baron von Steuben, of the Continental Army; and H. R. 17192. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the city of Buffalo, Wyo., for certain tracts of land.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I call up a conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up conference report on the Military Academy appropriation bill, which will be read by the Clerk.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the statement only be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will read both the report and the statement.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. We desire to raise the question of consideration. I want to raise it now or after the reading, which ever the Chair decides is proper.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report and the statement now.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16970) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 7, 13, and 14. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$34,165."

J. A. T. HULL,
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
R. A. ALGER,
E. W. PETTUS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees was read, as follows:

The conferees on the part of the House on H. R. 16970 submit the following report:

Amendment No. 1 makes an addition to the corps of cadets now authorized by law of one cadet from Porto Rico. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2 increases the pay of the librarian at the Military Academy by \$500 a year, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 3 is the total for civilian employees, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4 is for cleaning public buildings (not quarters), and the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are verbal changes in regard to the band library, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7 relates to music folios, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 12 relates to an additional amount of \$219 for the purchase of a boiler for the cadet laundry, and the House recedes, being merely a verbal change from the House provision.

Amendment No. 13 makes an appropriation for the replacing of crockery used in the cadet mess, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 14 relates to worn-out tablecloths, napkins, etc., and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 15 relates to the total for incidental expenses, and the Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17 are verbal changes in the appropriation for wiring hospital, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 18 makes the appropriation for wagon road from the railroad station immediately available, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 19 relates to appropriation for gas and electric-light fixtures for the new building for officers' mess and quarters, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 20 is for relaying the terrace platform, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 21 relates only to the total for buildings and grounds.

Amendment No. 22 corrects an error in the act to increase the efficiency of the Army, which act made the Chief of Artillery a brigadier-general and reduced the number of other brigadier-generals to 14, whereas 15 are required to command the brigades made by the 45 regiments of cavalry and artillery. This amendment restores the number required for that purpose and reduces the colonels of artillery by one. The House recedes.

J. A. T. HULL,
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,
Conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I raise the question of consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. I make the point of order that that is dilatory at this stage in the proceedings of the session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee raises the question of consideration; the gentleman from New York makes the point of order that that is a dilatory motion. The right to raise the question of consideration is not one given by the Constitution, but by the rules of the House. The rules of the House also provide that dilatory motions shall not be entertained by the Speaker. Therefore that motion is governed by the dilatory rule. It is perfectly plain to the Chair, and possibly to the gentleman making the motion, that this is a dilatory motion. At least the Chair is perfectly conscientious in so holding, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. From that I respectfully appeal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair classes that with its mate—that it is dilatory, and declines to entertain the appeal. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I concede under the rules that it is in the power of the Chair.

Mr. HULL. There has been but very little real change in the bill as it passed the House. While the gentleman who represented the minority in conference was absent, the gentleman from Virginia, a member of the Military Committee, and the gentleman from Tennessee, also a member of the Military Committee—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The point of order is that under the rule debate is out of order.

The SPEAKER. It is impossible to hear the gentleman. The gentleman from Mississippi will state his point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The point of order is that the gentleman is out of order in discussing or debating the matter now before the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then I make the point of order that this debate is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. HULL. As I was just saying, the reason that the report was not signed by all the members of the conference committee is because the gentleman from New York appointed to represent the minority on the conference was absent from the city. Two members of the minority were present and participated in the conference, and I think I am violating no rule in saying that the agreement reached was satisfactory to them and all the members on the conference. Mr. Speaker, there is no part of this, in my judgment, that needs explanation. I do not think that anybody desires one, and if there is, I will be glad to answer any question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. HULL. I do for a question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. With no desire to delay the proceedings of the House at all, but in perfect sincerity, I would like to know the changes that have been made in the bill since it left the House and went to the Senate and what amendments put on the bill by the Senate have been agreed to by the conferees.

Mr. HULL. The first amendment added a cadet for Porto Rico and provided that he should be a native. The House has agreed to that. It makes an additional cadet at West Point, to be appointed by the President, for Porto Rico. Another amendment disagreed to was to increase the salary of the librarian from \$2,500 to \$3,000. That amendment the Senate receded from and left the salary the same as the House passed it—at \$2,500.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand the gentleman. Do I understand that the salary of the librarian has been raised to \$3,000?

Mr. HULL. I say that was disagreed to by the House, and the Senate receded, leaving the salary of the librarian the same as now fixed by law. The item for electrical fixtures for the new building for officers' mess and quarters should have been put upon

the deficiency bill, but it was supposed that it had passed the Senate, and it could not be placed there, so it was allowed to remain here. The proposition for relaying the terrace platform at memorial hall was agreed to by the House conferees. It was understood by the Military Committee of the House when that question was before us that that would be put in the bill in the Senate, for the reason that they did not have sufficient estimates when before the House committee to know what ought to be given, and it was left over for the Senate to take that up. So that was agreed to.

The only amendment affecting in any way legislation in the bill that was allowed to remain is that part in regard to the amendment to the act increasing the efficiency of the Army. When that bill passed we made the Chief of Artillery a brigadier-general and reduced the number of brigadiers to 14. The Secretary of War sends a letter calling attention to the fact that when we passed the bill for the organization of the Army we provided there should be a Chief of Artillery with the rank of colonel—this in addition to the 13 colonels. And then we passed a provision making the Chief of Artillery a brigadier-general, and we cut down the brigadier-generals to 14, complying with the organization prescribed by law. We by this amendment increase the brigadier-generals to 15, so as to provide for the number required by law to command the brigades, and reduce the colonels of artillery to 13 to comply with the organization provided by law for the Artillery Corps.

There are 45 regiments, and it requires 15 brigadier-generals to command them, and we do it because the militia bill provides that the militia must be organized as the Regular Army, and it makes an harmonious organization.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman takes his seat, I would ask if he will not yield us three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; I could not do that.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, then, yield half an hour.

Mr. HULL. I am satisfied that under any other conditions the gentleman would not want the time.

Mr. HAY. I want it now, under these conditions.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he intends to close without granting this side any time?

Mr. HULL. Yes. You do not want any time except to kill time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw his motion?

Mr. HULL. No; I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call for a division.

Mr. HULL. Well, Mr. Speaker, we may as well have the yeas and nays. I ask the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 78, answered "present" 10, not voting 120; as follows:

YEAS—143.

Acheson,	Dick,	Jenkins,	Patterson, Pa.
Alexander,	Douglas,	Jones, Wash.	Payne,
Allen, Me.	Dover,	Kahn,	Pearre,
Aplin,	Draper,	Ketcham,	Perkins,
Ball, Del.	Driscoll,	Knapp,	Powers, Mass.
Bartholdt,	Dwight,	Kyle,	Reeder,
Bates,	Eddy,	Lacey,	Reeves,
Bishop,	Emerson,	Landis,	Scott,
Blackburn,	Esch,	Lessler,	Showalter,
Boreing,	Evans,	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Ill.
Boutell,	Fletcher,	Littaner,	Smith, Iowa
Bowersock,	Foerderer,	Long,	Smith, H. C.
Brandegge,	Foss,	Loudenslager,	Smith, S. W.
Brick,	Foster, Vt.	Lovering,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bromwell,	Fowler,	McCall,	Southard,
Brown,	Gaines, W. Va.	McLachlan,	Southwick,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner, Mass.	Mahoney,	Sperry,
Burkett,	Gardner, N. J.	Mann,	Sulloway,
Burleigh,	Gibson,	Marshall,	Tawney,
Burton,	Graft,	Martin,	Taylor, Ohio
Butler,	Greene, Mass.	Maynard,	Thomas, Iowa
Calderhead,	Grosvenor,	Mercer,	Tirrell,
Cannon,	Hamilton,	Miers, Ind.	Tompkins, N. Y.
Cassell,	Hanbury,	Miller,	Tompkins, Ohio
Conner,	Haugen,	Moody,	Van Voorhis,
Coombs,	Hedge,	Morgan,	Vreeland,
Cooper, Wis.	Hemenway,	Morris,	Wagener,
Cousins,	Hepburn,	Moss,	Wagner,
Cromer,	Hildebrandt,	Mudd,	Warner,
Crumpacker,	Holliday,	Needham,	Weeks,
Currier,	Howard,	Nevin,	Woods,
Cushman,	Howell,	Olmsted,	Wright,
Dalzell,	Hughes,	Otjen,	Young.
Darragh,	Hull,	Overstreet,	
Davidson,	Irwin,	Palmer,	
Deemer,	Jackson, Md.	Parker,	

NAYS—78.

Adamson,	Feely,	Lloyd,	Shallenberger,
Allen, Ky.	Fitzgerald,	McClellan,	Sheppard,
Ball, Tex.	Flanagan,	McCulloch,	Sims,
Billmeyer,	Flood,	McRae,	Slayden,
Breazeale,	Gaines, Tenn.	Maddox,	Smith, Ky.
Brouseard,	Goldfogle,	Mickey,	Snodgrass,
Brundidge,	Gooch,	Moon,	Snook,
Burgess,	Gordon,	Neville,	Sparkman,
Burleson,	Griggs,	Padgett,	Stark,
Caldwell,	Hay,	Patterson, Tenn.	Swanson,
Candler,	Jackson, Kans.	Pou,	Tate,
Cassingham,	Jones, Va.	Randall, Tex.	Trimble,
Clark,	Kern,	Richardson, Ala.	Underwood,
Clayton,	Kitchin, Claude	Rixey,	Vandiver,
Coney,	Kleberg,	Robb,	White,
Cowherd,	Kluttz,	Robinson, Ind.	Wiley,
Davey, La.	Lester,	Rucker,	Williams, Ill.
Davis, Fla.	Lever,	Russell,	Williams, Miss.
De Armond,	Lewis, Ga.	Ryan,	
Dinsmore,	Livingston,	Shackleford,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10.

Bartlett,	Henry, Conn.	Morrell,	Thompson.
Bowie,	Joy,	Prince,	
Dayton,	Mahon,	Sherman,	

NOT VOTING—120.

Adams,	Finley,	Lamb,	Ruppert,
Babcock,	Fleming,	Lassiter,	Scarborough,
Bankhead,	Fordney,	Latimer,	Schirm,
Barney,	Foster, Ill.	Lawrence,	Selby,
Beidler,	Fox,	Lindsay,	Shaffroth,
Bell,	Gardner, Mich.	Little,	Shattuc,
Bellamy,	Gilbert,	Littlefield,	Shelden,
Belmont,	Gill,	Loud,	Sibley,
Benton,	Gillet, N. Y.	McAndrews,	Skiles,
Bingham,	Gillet, Mass.	McClary,	Small,
Blakeney,	Glass,	McDermott,	Spight,
Brantley,	Glenn,	McLain,	Steele,
Bristow,	Graham,	Metcalf,	Stephens, Tex.
Brownlow,	Green, Pa.	Meyer, La.	Stevens, Minn.
Bull,	Griffith,	Minor,	Stewart, N. J.
Burk, Pa.	Grow,	Mondell,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burnett,	Haskins,	Mutchler,	Storm,
Capron,	Heatwole,	Naphen,	Sulzer,
Cochran,	Henry, Miss.	Newlands,	Sutherland,
Connell,	Henry, Tex.	Norton,	Swann,
Conry,	Hill,	Pierce,	Talbert,
Cooper, Tex.	Hitt,	Powers, Me.	Taylor, Ala.
Corliss,	Hooker,	Pugsley,	Thayer,
Creamer,	Hopkins,	Ransdell, La.	Thomas, N. C.
Crowley,	Jack,	Reid,	Wadsworth,
Curtis,	Jett,	Rhea,	Watson,
Dahle,	Johnson,	Richardson, Tenn.	Wheeler,
Dougherty,	Kehoe,	Roberts,	Wilson,
Edwards,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Robertson, La.	Wooten,
Elliott,	Knox,	Robinson, Nebr.	Zenor.

So the previous question was ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. POWERS of Maine with Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. SIBLEY with Mr. RHEA.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. THOMPSON.

For this vote:

Mr. SCHIRM with Mr. WOOTEN.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye," and wish to change my vote to "present."

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, and he answered "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I demand a division.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 13, answered "present" 10, not voting 114; as follows:

YEAS—214.

Acheson,	Burgess,	Cushman,	Flanagan,
Adamson,	Burke, S. Dak.	Dahle,	Fletcher,
Allen, Ky.	Burkett,	Dalzell,	Flood,
Aplin,	Burleigh,	Darragh,	Fordney,
Ball, Del.	Burton,	Davey, La.	Foss,
Ball, Tex.	Butler,	Davidson,	Foster, Vt.
Bankhead,	Calderhead,	Davis, Fla.	Fowler,
Barney,	Candler,	De Armond,	Gaines, W. Va.
Bartholdt,	Cannon,	Deemer,	Gardner, Mass.
Bates,	Capron,	Dick,	Gardner, Mich.
Billmeyer,	Clark,	Dougherty,	Gardner, N. J.
Bishop,	Clayton,	Douglas,	Gibson,
Blackburn,	Coombs,	Dover,	Gillet, N. Y.
Boreing,	Cooper, Wis.	Draper,	Goldfogle,
Boutell,	Cousins,	Driscoll,	Gordon,
Bowersock,	Cowherd,	Eddy,	Graft,
Brandegge,	Cromer,	Emerson,	Greene, Mass.
Brick,	Currier,	Esch,	Griggs,
Brown,		Evans,	Grosvenor,
		Feely,	Haugen,

Hay,	Livingston,	Parker,	Snook,
Hedge,	Lloyd,	Patterson, Pa.	Southard,
Henry, Tex.	Long,	Patterson, Tenn.	Sperry,
Hill,	Loving,	Payne,	Stark,
Hitt,	McAndrews,	Pearre,	Sulloway,
Hopkins,	McCall,	Perkins,	Swanson,
Howard,	McClellan,	Pou,	Tate,
Howell,	McCulloch,	Powers, Mass.	Taylor, Ala.
Hughes,	McLachlan,	Randell, Tex.	Thomas, Iowa
Hull,	Maddox,	Reeder,	Tirrell,
Irwin,	Mahoney,	Reeves,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Jackson, Kans.	Mann,	Richardson, Ala.	Tompkins, Ohio
Jackson, Md.	Marshall,	Richardson, Tenn.	Trimble,
Jenkins,	Martin,	Robb,	Underwood,
Jones, Va.	Maynard,	Roberts,	Vandiver,
Jones, Wash.	Mercer,	Robinson, Ind.	Van Voorhis,
Joy,	Mickey,	Rucker,	Vreeland,
Kahn,	Miers, Ind.	Russell,	Wachter,
Kehoe,	Miller,	Ryan,	Wadsworth,
Kern,	Minor,	Scarborough,	Wagoner,
Kitchin, Claude	Moody,	Schirm,	Wanger,
Kitchin, Wm. W.	Moon,	Scott,	Warner,
Kluttz,	Morgan,	Selby,	Warnock,
Knapp,	Morrell,	Shallenberger,	Watson,
Kyle,	Moss,	Showalter,	Weeks,
Lacey,	Mudd,	Slayden,	Wiley,
Latimer,	Mutchler,	Small,	Williams, Ill.
Lawrence,	Needham,	Smith, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Lessler,	Nevin,	Smith, Iowa.	Woods,
Lester,	Newlands,	Smith, Ky.	Wright,
Lever,	Olmsted,	Smith, H. C.	Young,
Lewis, Ga.	Otjen,	Smith, S. W.	Zenor.
Lewis, Pa.	Overstreet,	Smith, Wm. Alden	
Littauer,	Palmer,	Snodgrass,	

NAYS—13.

Brundidge,	Gooch,	Padgett,	White.
Burleson,	Little,	Shackleford,	
Dinsmore,	McLain,	Sheppard,	
Gaines, Tenn.	McRae,	Sims,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10.

Bartlett,	Finley,	Prince,	Thompson.
Bowie,	Henry, Conn.	Rixey,	
Dayton,	McCleary,	Sherman,	

NOT VOTING—114.

Adams,	Creamer,	Jack,	Robinson, Nebr.
Alexander,	Curtis,	Jett,	Ruppert,
Allen, Me.	Dwight,	Johnson,	Shafroth,
Babcock,	Edwards,	Ketcham,	Shattuc,
Beidler,	Elliott,	Kleberg,	Shelden,
Bell,	Fitzgerald,	Knox,	Sibley,
Bellamy,	Fleming,	Lamb,	Skiles,
Belmont,	Foerderer,	Landis,	Southwick,
Benton,	Foster, Ill.	Lassiter,	Sparkman,
Bingham,	Fox,	Lindsay,	Spight,
Blakeney,	Gilbert,	Littlefield,	Steele,
Brantley,	Gill,	Loud,	Stephens, Tex.
Bristow,	Gillett, Mass.	Loudenslager,	Stevens, Minn.
Bromwell,	Glass,	McDermott,	Stewart, N. J.
Broussard,	Glenn,	Mahon,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brownlow,	Graham,	Metcalf,	Storm,
Bull,	Green, Pa.	Meyer, La.	Sulzer,
Burk, Pa.	Griffith,	Mondell,	Sutherland,
Burnett,	Grow,	Morris,	Swann,
Caldwell,	Hamilton,	Naphen,	Talbert,
Cassel,	Hanbury,	Neville,	Tawney,
Cassingham,	Haskins,	Norton,	Taylor, Ohio
Cochran,	Heatwole,	Pierce,	Thayer,
Connell,	Hemenway,	Powers, Me.	Thomas, N. C.
Conner,	Henry, Miss.	Pugsley,	Wheeler,
Conry,	Hepburn,	Ransdell, La.	Wilson,
Cooney,	Hildebrandt,	Reid,	Wooten.
Cooper, Tex.	Holliday,	Rhea,	
Corliss,	Hooker,	Robertson, La.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. CASSINGHAM.

Mr. STORM with Mr. NEVILLE.

On this vote:

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BROUSSARD.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16842) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 17046) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. TILLMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16888. An act to extend to the port of Niagara Falls, N. Y., the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement;

H. R. 3100. An act providing for the conveyance of Widows Island, Maine, to the State of Maine;

H. R. 15461. An act for the relief of Daniel F. Lee;

H. R. 15985. An act to confirm certain forest lieu selections made under the act approved June 4, 1897;

H. R. 7864. An act to pay John F. Lawson \$237.96, balance due him for services as United States mail carrier;

H. R. 2987. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Rittenhouse;

H. R. 7433. An act granting an increase of pension to Byron C. Knapp;

H. R. 8149. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. Martin;

H. R. 10175. An act granting a pension to Mary R. Bayly, formerly Mary S. Redick;

H. R. 16970. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16573. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across St. Francis River at or near the town of St. Francis, Ark.; and

H. R. 16069. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands therein mentioned.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 6139. An act amending the civil code of Alaska, providing for the organization of private corporations, and for other purposes.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. MERCER. I move to suspend the rules and pass, with the amendments of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Senate bill 7414.

Mr. MANN and Mr. UNDERWOOD demanded a second on the motion.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen must not be impatient. The Chair has not stated the motion. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] moves to suspend the rules and pass, with the amendments of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 7414) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I demand a second on this motion.

The SPEAKER. The demand is made prematurely. The gentleman knows that the bill must first be reported.

The bill, with the amendments reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to give effect to and execute the provisions of existing legislation authorizing the purchase of sites and the erection thereon of public buildings in the several cities hereinafter enumerated, the limit of cost heretofore fixed by Congress therefor be, and the same is hereby, increased, respectively, as follows, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the completion of each of said buildings within its respective limit of cost, including site, hereby fixed:

United States post-office and court-house at Harrison, Ark., from \$70,000 to \$100,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Fresno, Cal., from \$100,000 to \$150,000.

United States post-office at Chillicothe, Ohio, from \$70,000 to \$80,000.

United States post-office and custom-house at Perth Amboy, N. J., from \$50,000 to \$80,000.

United States custom-house at San Francisco, Cal., from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, provide space in said custom-house for the subtreasury.

United States post-office at Colorado Springs, Colo., from \$135,000 to \$175,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Rome, Ga., from \$59,104.48 to \$134,104.48.

United States post-office at Dekalb, Ill., from \$55,000 to \$100,000.

United States post-office at Hutchinson, Kans., from \$50,000 to \$60,000.

United States post-office at Kankakee, Ill., from \$70,000 to \$80,000.

United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Chicago, Ill., from \$4,000,000 to \$4,790,000.

United States post-office and revenue office at Pekin, Ill., from \$70,000 to \$80,000.

United States post-office at Lawrence, Kans., from \$50,000 to \$80,000.

United States post-office at Emporia, Kans., from \$51,000 to \$60,000.

United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Indianapolis, Ind., from \$2,300,100 to \$2,600,100, to be used by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, for the completion of said building and making such improvements as in his judgment may be deemed necessary, including changes of north front, interior finish of every nature, approaches, and other improvements.

United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Council Bluffs, Iowa, from \$247,847.39 to \$255,347.39; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to purchase for the United States the tract of ground

lying immediately west of the ground now owned by the United States in the city of Council Bluffs on which the United States public building used for court-house, post-office, and other governmental offices is situated, the ground so authorized to be purchased being 30 feet wide and extending south from Broadway street, in said city, to the first alley south of said Broadway street: *Provided*, That said tract can be purchased at a sum not to exceed \$7,500.

United States post-office at Maysville, Ky., from \$40,000 to \$50,000.
United States post-office at Henderson, Ky., from \$40,000 to \$50,000.
United States post-office at Fitchburg, Mass., from \$125,000 to \$130,000.
United States post-office at Battle Creek, Mich., from \$100,000 to \$110,000.
United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Elizabeth City, N. C., from \$120,000 to \$135,000; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to exchange the present site for a new site, or to purchase or condemn a new site and sell the present site, either at public or private sale, whenever such sale can be made for the best interests of the Government; and in the event of sale of the present site the proceeds of such sale shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt derived from the sale of public property.

United States post-office at Centerville, Iowa, from \$35,000 to \$40,000.
United States post-office and custom-house at Durham, N. C., from \$70,000 to \$100,000.

United States post-office at Goldsboro, N. C., from \$35,000 to \$50,000.
United States post-office at Elizabeth, N. J., from \$135,000 to \$200,000.
United States post-office at Niagara Falls, N. Y., from \$75,000 to \$150,000; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to provide space in the building for the customs service in said city, said building to be used for post-office and custom-house business.

United States post-office and court-house at Rochester, N. Y., from \$647,533.52 to \$707,533.52.

United States post-office at Oil City, Pa., from \$90,000 to \$55,000: *Provided*, That the cost of site shall not exceed the sum of \$25,000.

United States post-office at McKeesport, Pa., from \$100,000 to \$110,000.

United States post-office at Washington, Pa., from \$90,000 to \$55,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Nashville, Tenn., from \$574,948.65 to \$634,948.65.

United States post-office at Allentown, Pa., from \$100,000 to \$110,000.

United States post-office and revenue office at Martinsville, Va., from \$35,000 to \$45,000.

United States post-office at Janesville, Wis., from \$75,000 to \$81,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Evanston, Wyo., from \$100,000 to \$179,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Guthrie, Okla., from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

United States post-office at Huntington, W. Va., from \$125,000 to \$150,000.

United States post-office at Atlantic City, N. J., from \$125,000 to \$150,000.

United States post-office at Oak Park, Ill., from \$35,000 to \$45,000.

United States post-office at Rockhill, S. C., from \$35,000 to \$45,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Sherman, Tex., from \$125,000 to \$145,000.

United States post-office at Wausau, Wis., from \$50,000 to \$57,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Batesville, Ark., from \$70,000 to \$80,000.

United States post-office and court-house at St. Joseph, Mo., from \$390,140.66 to \$590,000.

United States post-office at Fond du Lac, Wis., from \$90,000 to \$95,000.

United States post-office at Amesbury, Mass., from \$45,000 to \$47,000: *Provided*, That that portion of section 19 in public act No. 146, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, which provides that a site shall be bounded upon at least two sides by streets shall not apply to a site to be selected in Amesbury, Mass.

Municipal building, Washington, D. C., from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000; one half of which shall be chargeable to the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half to be paid out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and the title to the site heretofore acquired for said municipal building is hereby transferred from the Government of the United States to the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That nothing in this section contained shall be held to repeal or modify the provisions of "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, so far as the said act provides that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall act jointly in contracting for erecting and completing a building for the accommodation of the municipal and other offices in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the erection and completion of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States governmental offices upon ground now owned by the United States in each of the following cities, respectively, within its respective limit of cost hereby fixed:

United States post-office at Sterling, Ill., \$35,000.
United States post-office at Champaign, Ill., \$70,000.
United States post-office at Traverse City, Mich., \$40,000.
United States post-office at Moberly, Mo., \$35,000.
United States post-office at Columbia, Mo., \$35,000.
United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Tacoma, Wash., \$400,000.

United States post-office and court-house at Spokane Falls, Wash., \$400,000: *Provided*, That in the public buildings at Tacoma and Spokane Falls, in the State of Washington, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide for elevators.

United States post-office, court-house, and land office at Pierre, S. Dak., \$100,000.

United States post-office and other Government offices at Yankton, S. Dak., \$50,000.

United States post-office and land office at Natchitoches, La., \$60,000.

That the buildings provided for in this section shall be unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys.

SEC. 3. That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to give effect to and execute the provisions of existing legislation authorizing the purchase of sites in the several cities hereinafter enumerated the limit of cost heretofore fixed by Congress therefor be, and the same is hereby, increased, respectively, as follows:

United States post-office at Bar Harbor, Me., from \$6,000 to \$12,000.
United States post-office and custom-house at Calais, Me., from \$6,000 to \$12,000.
United States post-office at Hamilton, Ohio, from \$20,000 to \$30,000.
United States post-office at Albert Lea, Minn., from \$3,000 to \$6,000.
United States post-office at Crookston, Minn., from \$4,000 to \$6,000.

United States post-office at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., from \$15,000 to \$20,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized in his discretion to contract for the erection and completion of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other governmental offices upon site secured or to be secured within the limit of cost herein provided at Albert Lea, Minn., and Saratoga Springs, N. Y., the limit of cost of building at Albert Lea, Minn., to be \$20,000, and the limit of cost of building at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., to be \$70,000.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional land for the enlargement of the site of the United States post-office building in the city of Augusta, Me.; and the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, so far as the same relates to said building, are hereby amended accordingly.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise a suitable site for the United States post-office and other governmental offices in each of the cities enumerated in this section within its respective limit of cost hereby fixed:

United States post-office at Dixon, Ill., \$10,000.
United States post-office at Tuscaloosa, Ala., \$7,500.
United States post-office at Hagerstown, Md., \$10,000.
United States post-office at East Liverpool, Ohio, \$30,000.
United States post-office at Florence, Ala., \$7,500.
United States post-office at York, Nebr., \$10,000.
United States post-office at Ann Arbor, Mich., \$12,000.
United States post-office at Carbondale, Pa., \$12,000.
United States post-office at Grand Island, Nebr., \$10,000.
United States post-office at Woonsocket, R. I., \$15,000.
United States post-office and court-house at Bluefields, W. Va., \$10,000.
United States post-office at Chippewa Falls, Wis., \$10,000.
United States court-house at Portland, Me., \$60,000.
United States post-office at Bedford, Ind., \$6,000.
United States post-office at Marinette, Wis., \$10,000.
United States post-office at Gainesville, Ga., \$5,000.
United States post-office at Valdosta, Ga., \$8,000.
United States post-office at Webster City, Iowa, \$8,000.
United States post-office at Butler, Pa., \$20,000.
United States post-office at Corning, N. Y., \$15,000.
United States post-office at Westminster, Md., \$4,000.
United States post-office at Meadville, Pa., \$8,000.
United States post-office at Mason City, Iowa, \$8,000.
United States post-office at Marion, Ind., \$25,000.
United States post-office at Pine Bluff, Ark., \$7,000.

United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Houston, Tex., \$125,000: *Provided*, That an entire block or square of ground bounded upon each side by a street can be secured within the limit of \$125,000: *Provided further*, however, That if the Secretary of the Treasury can not secure an entire block or square of ground within said limit of cost of \$125,000 in said city, then the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to secure a site of less area than an entire block or square of ground within a limit of cost of \$70,000.

United States post-office at Baker City, Oreg., \$5,000.

United States post-office at Bessemer, Ala., \$12,000.

United States post-office at Ocala, Fla., \$4,000.

SEC. 6. That section 7 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, be amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell the old custom-house building and the site thereof, at the corner of Ninth and Walnut streets, in the city of Kansas City, State of Missouri, at public or private sale, at such time and on such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States, but at not less than \$260,000, to execute a quitclaim deed to the purchaser thereof, and to apply the proceeds of the sale of said property toward the enlargement and improvement of the post-office and court-house building in said city, the total cost of which enlargement and improvement, complete in all respects, shall not exceed the sum of \$400,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to enter into contracts to the full limit of cost for such extension and improvement hereby fixed, subject to future appropriations to be made by Congress."

SEC. 7. That so much of the provisions of section 1 of the Act of Congress entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, as relates to the United States post-office and court-house at Lincoln, Nebr., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed, upon lands now belonging to the United States, adjacent to the United States post-office and court-house at Lincoln, Nebr., a suitable building, with fireproof vaults and elevators therein, for the accommodation of the United States courts, post-office, customs service, and other Government offices in said city, at a total cost, including said vaults, elevators, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, of not to exceed the sum of \$350,000: *Provided*, That the building when completed shall be unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet on all sides, including streets and alleys."

"When said new building is completed and occupied the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to sell to the city of Lincoln, Nebr., to be used for municipal purposes only, the present United States post-office and court-house building in Lincoln, Nebr., together with such portion of the site on which the same is located as may not be needed by the United States, but not exceeding the south 85 feet extending east and west along the south side of the block or square of ground between Ninth and Tenth streets in said city, at such time and upon such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States, and at a price not less than \$50,000: *Provided*, That the net proceeds of such sale shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt derived from the sale of public property: *Provided further*, That when the city of Lincoln, Nebr., ceases to use the building and site above described for municipal purposes the same shall revert to the possession and ownership of the United States Government."

SEC. 8. That section 18 of public act numbered 146, approved June 6, 1902, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 18. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to dispose of the present post-office and custom-house build-

ing in the city of Burlington, State of Vermont, on the best terms obtainable, and to cause to be erected on the site thereof a suitable, commodious, fireproof building for the accommodation of all the branches of the Federal service in said city, at a total cost, including heating and ventilating apparatus, fireproof vaults, elevators, and approaches, of not to exceed \$200,000; and for the purpose of providing suitable quarters and accommodations for the use of the various branches of the public service in said city, pending the removal of the present Federal building, and the erection and completion of the new building hereinbefore authorized, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed, ready for occupancy, a temporary building for said purposes, on the south 80 feet of the Federal building site in said city, at a total cost for said temporary building of not to exceed \$10,000, including the expense of moving the various branches of the public service into said temporary building, said amount being additional to the limit of cost hereby fixed for the erection of the permanent building hereinbefore authorized. That after the completion and occupancy of the new permanent building hereinbefore authorized the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to sell, at such time and upon such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States, said temporary building, together with the strip of land on which the same is situated, not to exceed 80 feet in width on Church street, with a depth of not to exceed 254 feet 6 inches, and to deposit the proceeds in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt."

SEC. 9. That so much of the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, as relates to the United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Richmond, Va., be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Richmond, Va., from \$516,628.08 to \$591,628.08; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized in his discretion to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the Shafer property adjoining the present post-office site in Richmond, Va., having a frontage of 60 feet on Main and Bank streets and a depth of 160 feet from Main to Bank streets, containing about 9,600 square feet, within a limit of cost of \$75,000, hereby fixed, unless a higher value, not exceeding \$202,350, be fixed in the condemnation proceedings hereinbefore authorized."

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional ground to the south of the present site of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including heating and ventilating apparatus and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the laundry and stable of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized to erect upon the site now occupied by the laundry and stable buildings of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, situated to the west of the main building, an addition to the present Bureau of Engraving and Printing building consisting of two stories and basement, approximately, 47 feet in width by 248 in length, for the use and accommodation of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The total limit of cost for additional ground and buildings herein mentioned, including removal of laundry and stable of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, shall not exceed the sum of \$215,000.

SEC. 11. That so much of the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, as relates to the United States post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Atlanta, Ga., be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, in the city of Atlanta, Ga., a site upon which to erect a United States post-office, custom-house, and court-house building, said site to consist of an entire block or square of ground, bounded on each side by a street, the limit of cost of site to be \$200,000."

SEC. 12. That section 8 of the act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site and to contract for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office in the city of St. Louis and State of Missouri, the cost of said site and building not to exceed \$700,000: *Provided*, That the site selected shall consist of an area of not less than 75,000 square feet, and shall be located as near as possible to the union railway station in said city."

SEC. 13. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to secure, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the entire square No. 324 in the city of Washington, D. C., bounded by C street on the north, by Eleventh street on the east, by Twelfth street on the west, and Government reservation on the south, and to reserve the said square as a site for an addition to the post-office building in said city, including space for the mail-bag repair shop.

SEC. 14. That the law (Public, No. 146) entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, be amended so as to transpose the provision for a United States post-office at Oklahoma City, Okla., from section 2 to section 3 of said act.

SEC. 15. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase or cause to be taken for public use, by condemnation or otherwise, as a site for a hall of records, the whole of the land embraced in square 143 in the city of Washington, D. C., containing 157,711.35 square feet of ground, having a frontage of 402.08 feet on F street, the same on E street, and 322.7 feet frontage on Nineteenth street, and the same on Eighteenth street, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress a full statement showing size and public cost of building to be erected upon said square as a hall of records.

SEC. 16. That the law (Public, No. 146) entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1902, be amended so as to transpose the provisions for a United States post-office at Owosso, Mich., and Louisiana, Mo., from section 3 to section 4 of said act; and the limit of cost for site and building in each of said cities is hereby increased from \$35,000 to \$40,000: *Provided*, That the limit of cost of site in each of said cities shall be \$5,000.

SEC. 17. That section 14 of Public act No. 146, approved June 6, 1902, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection

and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes," is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in the city of Toledo and State of Ohio upon which to erect a building for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office and other governmental offices in said city: *Provided*, That the site selected shall consist of an entire block or square of ground, bounded on each side by a street, and shall consist in area of not less than 70 square feet, within a limit of cost of \$300,000, hereby fixed: *And provided further*, That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall be unable to obtain a site as above described, then and in that case he is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a tract of land fronting on St. Clair street, immediately adjoining the present post-office site, having an area of 14,400 square feet, said tract of land being 120 feet square, within a limit of cost of \$32,000, hereby fixed. When the Secretary of the Treasury has acquired either an entire block of ground or the tract of land adjoining the present site, as herein provided, he shall make a report to Congress, stating the location, dimensions, and cost of the land so acquired, and recommend to Congress the character and size of building that should be erected thereon and submit an estimate of the cost of said building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches."

SEC. 18. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall require all owners or agents of sites in each city mentioned in this act, where sites or additions to sites are to be purchased, to submit offers of sale in writing, and no payment shall be made to any owner or agent of the property involved on account of the land proposed to be sold or purchased and no plans shall be drawn or money expended for a building upon a donated site until a written opinion of the Attorney-General of the United States shall be filed with the Secretary of the Treasury in favor of the validity of the title of the land agreed to be purchased or donated. And in case a site or addition to a site acquired under the provisions of this act contains a building or buildings the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to rent until their removal becomes necessary such of said buildings as he may deem desirable at a fair rental value, the proceeds thereof to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, and a report of the proceedings to be submitted to Congress annually: *Provided*, That each site selected under the provisions of this act shall contain not less than 15,000 square feet of ground space, and shall be bounded upon at least two sides by streets.

SEC. 19. That if condemnation proceedings are necessary to acquire land within the District of Columbia, such proceedings shall be in the manner prescribed for providing a site for an addition to the Government Printing Office in so much of the act approved July 1, 1898, as is set forth on pages 648 and 649 of volume 30 of the United States Statutes at Large.

SEC. 20. That all acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. MANN demanded a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. MERCER. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. MANN. It is very obvious that if I do not object to that proposition nobody else will, so I object.

The SPEAKER appointed as tellers Mr. MERCER and Mr. MANN.

Mr. RODEY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for leave to amend the bill.

The SPEAKER. The House is proceeding under another order. The tellers will take their places.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 167, noes 11. So the motion to suspend the rules was seconded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] to control the time in favor of the bill and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in opposition.

[Mr. MERCER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have no expectation of throwing any impediment in the way of the passage of this bill. It is going to pass. The boys are all provided for.

Several MEMBERS. Not all.

Mr. HEPBURN. But I do want to make a suggestion that I think is timely; not that I think it will affect this legislation today, but it may affect the minds of some gentlemen, so that on a future occasion we may adopt a better plan than that figured out in this bill. And right here, while I am passing, I want to say that I think the city of Chicago has been pretty well cared for. Within the last thirty years the Government erected a building there that cost four and one-half million dollars. That building was torn down because it was said to be unsuitable for a great city like Chicago. All sorts of lies were told about the unsafety of this building.

Commission after commission was fixed up and dragooned into making uncanny reports, and at last it was condemned; but when it was sought to be taken down they had to blow it down with dynamite. There never was a better building, probably, in the city of Chicago than this one that was ruthlessly destroyed in order to make way for this one that we are now erecting. Now, we have appropriated \$4,000,000 to build that building on a \$6,000,000 lot, and here is the proposition to add, perhaps, a million dollars more, for what? For interior decoration. That is what it is for, I am told, for the interior decoration of this \$4,000,000 building. And I warn you, gentlemen, that before we get through with it another million dollars will be necessary.

Now, I think a better plan than that could be adopted. It would

be very much better to take \$3,000,000—a million and a half in a lot and a million and a half in a building—to erect a modern business building such as they are in the habit of building in Chicago. That would give us nearly an acre more of floor space than this one will give after it is completed. That is what we ought to do. Then we would save \$9,000,000. With that \$9,000,000 I would build 900 \$10,000 buildings for third and second class post-offices all over the United States. [Applause.] That would be a practical and sensible way to do. We expended, perhaps, \$20,000,000 a year or two ago. Here are \$6,000,000 more. If we would adopt this plan, build no extravagant, expensive buildings for the purpose of illustrating art—if we are going to preserve art and spend money for art, let us do it in our capital city—and build business buildings for the other cities of the United States, we should do better than we are doing now.

If I had the opportunity to do it I would move to recommit this bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with instructions to strike out all of the bill after the enacting clause and substitute therefor provisions requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to erect in each city or town in which there is a third or second class post-office, and where the citizens donate to the United States a site free of cost, a building for the use of the post-office at a cost not to exceed \$10,000, said committee to report forthwith.

Now, that is the course I would pursue. We might have to build some much larger buildings, but there are 3,000 post-offices in the United States where a building costing \$5,000 or \$10,000 would meet every demand—probably there are 4,000. There are now about 5,000 first, second, and third class offices. If we built a \$10,000 building for each of the 4,000 second and third class offices it would cost only twice as much as the legislation of last year authorized. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under the order just made by the House, those of us who would be glad to offer amendments to the bill are cut off. This bill, as it passed the Senate, increased the limit of cost for the public building at Jacksonville, Fla., \$200,000. The House committee have proposed an amendment, and under the rule adopted that amendment will go with the bill, cutting out that appropriation. I simply want to say that that was unjust, and the item ought not to have been cut out of the Senate bill by the House committee.

The public building in Jacksonville is far too small to accommodate present demands. The city has grown; its business has grown; the uses for this building have multiplied; and it was wrong and improper for that item to have been stricken out. It is wrong that those of us who would be glad to offer amendments to the bill are cut off by the order just made by the House. Reports made by the officials and occupants of the present building show its insufficiency and inadequacy. The Treasury Department recommends an increase in its size, and in justice to the people of that enterprising and growing city I enter my protest against this bill. Only two minutes have been given me to enter this protest. If I had had time I wanted to say something, too, for the important South Atlantic port of Fernandina, where there ought to be a public building, but I shall be heard on that proposition in the future.

Mr. MANN. I ask the gentleman from Nebraska to occupy some of his time—or will he occupy more except to close? [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. MERCER. I would prefer the gentleman to use his time now.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing, but I prefer not to have three or four speeches made after I conclude.

Mr. MERCER. What will be said will be in explanation; and I do not think it will be an argument against what the gentleman from Illinois has said.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not with any degree of pleasure that I oppose this bill. My opposition to the bill might be considered as a criticism upon the action of my colleagues from Chicago, who favor the bill; but no one would be more loth to criticise their conduct than myself. I recognize the fact that they are as sincere, as earnest, and as honest as I can claim to be. I doubt, also, whether my opposition to the bill will meet with the approval of most of my constituents, because it has come to that pass in the country—probably always was—that it is considered legitimate for the representatives of a particular locality to get out of the public Treasury all the money they possibly can for the benefit of, or expenditure in, their particular locality. I do not expect that my opposition to the bill will have any effect in the House upon its passage. Forty-one States are interested in the passage of this bill. Appropriations for public buildings are authorized by this bill in 41 different States, and most of the

representatives of those States have joined in a combination to secure the passage of the bill.

The pork packers of Chicago have proposed to organize one great company to control the packing industry, but their combination will never be as powerful and as monopolistic as the present combination in this House to distribute the "pork" contained in this barrel.

My Democratic friends, who so loudly inveigh against the combination of the Chicago pork packers, are very willing and anxious to join in the combination which gives them their share of the different brand of pork contained in this bill. Many of the items in the pending bill would fail to receive favorable consideration by this House if it were not that this combination exists here to pass the entire bill as it stands with the amendments proposed by the Public Buildings Committee.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to address myself particularly to the question of the \$790,000 increase for the Chicago post-office. I would like to see in my own city the most magnificent structure which can be or could be erected by the National Government. But I feel, in the conscientious discharge of my duty, I ought to state to the House some facts which have come to my notice.

I have no personal feeling in what I say. I have no personal acquaintance with any of the contractors or bidders on the Chicago building. I have had no personal dispute or quarrel in any way with any of the officers or contractors engaged on this building. I have no personal motive in opposing the proposed appropriation. Because there had been unseemly delay in the construction of the Chicago building I felt it my duty to make some investigation of the causes of delay, and in that investigation I came to know certain facts which caused me to look further into the matter.

I do not believe from my investigation that there is any necessity for a present increase of cost for the Chicago building. I do believe that under the present limit of cost the building might receive the very best finish which has been proposed by anyone.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MERCER] has stated here that the reason for increasing the limit of cost was because the price of materials and construction has increased in the country. The limit of cost of the Chicago building was first fixed at \$4,000,000, exclusive of the ground. It is proposed by this bill to increase the limit of cost to \$4,790,000.

In his testimony last March before the Committee on Appropriations the special architect for the Chicago building stated that there was no increase of cost demanded for this building on account of any increase in the cost of materials or construction. He said:

The big contract for the general construction was probably let at the cheapest time that has been since the time the building was talked of. That was in 1898, and I do not think that steel has been as cheap as it was then, and steel is a very large item. I know granite has not, before or since. In other words, there was a peculiarly fortunate time when that contract was let.

This statement was made in regard to the contract given to Mr. John Peirce for the exterior or superstructure. And then notice what the architect said further at the same time in reference to the interior work:

As to the remainder of the building, it can be let now just exactly as cheap as it ever could have been.

The excuse, therefore, that there has been an increase in the cost of materials and construction is shown to be false by the testimony of the special architect himself. Remember that the architect of the Chicago building is not the regular Government Architect. There is a special architect employed upon the building on entirely different terms from those of the Government Architect's office.

Why, then, is an increase asked for? I will tell you. It is a dishonest request. There is no need for an increase of money. It is a collusion between the special architect and the man to whom the contract has been let.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me an inquiry?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. I want to know what will be the additional compensation of the architect who recommends this new appropriation if it should be granted?

Mr. MANN. So far as the architect's fees are concerned, there will be no increase. The architect is paid \$4,500 a year, and the only increase he would receive in that way would be by the extension of time required. How much he may receive otherwise I can not tell, but I have no doubt that the amount will be very large indeed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MANN. My time is very limited.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is along the line of the gentleman's argument. I understood him to say that the architect

will receive an additional sum to the amount of his salary. Now, does he receive that lawfully?

Mr. MANN. He would not receive it lawfully.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. How, then, could he receive it? I do not understand.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I stated that there was in my opinion collusion between the special architect and the man who now has the contract, and if I can have a few minutes without interruption I think I can give the reason for my belief.

Bids were received for the interior work and completion of this building in September last. The lowest bidder was Mr. John Peirce, who bid on the work provided for by the specifications \$1,478,500. The next lowest bidder at that time was about \$400,000 above the bid of Mr. Peirce. Mr. Peirce was the contractor for the exterior or superstructure. When these bids were received, the first intention was to accept the bid of Mr. Peirce for the interior work on the ground that he was the lowest bidder. There was money enough then available under the original limit of cost to have accepted this bid.

In a written statement dated March 8 last, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this House, the special architect on this building stated that after the completion of the superstructure there would remain out of the original limit of cost \$1,721,181.91 available to complete the building. There were four sets of bids advertised for and received last fall, in order to complete the Chicago building in every respect. One was for the heating system, one for drainage, plumbing, and gas fitting, one for electric work and wiring, and the other was for interior work and completion. The contract for the heating system has been let at \$99,346; the contract for drainage, plumbing, and gas fitting has been let at \$62,590; the contract for electric work and wiring has been let at \$69,838; and if the bid of Mr. Peirce for interior work and completion of the building at \$1,478,500 had been accepted, this would have made a total cost of \$1,710,274, for which, according to the written statement of the special architect in March last, there was available \$1,721,181.91, besides the large sum of penalties due from Peirce for delay.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Peirce bid for the completion of the building was about \$400,000 lower than the next lowest bid; and his bid was rejected on the recommendation of the special architect made to the Secretary of the Treasury, and on the ground that there was not money enough within the limit of cost of \$4,000,000 to finish the building. The special architect thereupon readvertised for new bids on precisely the same specifications, with this exception: The original specifications were 458 in number and covered more than 40 pages of fine print. The exception consisted in a statement of certain omissions made in the blank form of bid and consisting of omissions named as omissions "A" to "R," inclusive. The omissions are stated in general terms and cover less than a page and a half in the same print. The bidders were asked to bid on the original specifications, basing their bid upon these omissions "A" to "R," inclusive, stated in the bid, and were also requested to make bids for the restoration of each item of omissions.

Mr. Peirce bid on the work, leaving out the omissions, \$997,500, and bid on restoring the omissions amounts equal to \$730,665. The second bid of Mr. Peirce, therefore, for the total work covered by the original specifications was \$1,728,165. The second bid of Mr. Peirce was dated November 2, 1902. This was for precisely the same work upon which he had bid in September \$1,478,500. His bid of \$1,478,500 was rejected in October on the recommendation of the special architect, and the contract was let to him in November on his second bid on precisely the same work and on the same specifications for \$1,728,165—a clear present to him of \$249,665 on the same specifications for the same work without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

Under this motion to suspend the rules I have not the time, in the twenty minutes allotted to the opposition for debate, to go into this matter at length. But I call your attention to the bids for the restoration of these various items of omission.

The contract for the interior work and completion of this building has been let to Mr. Peirce on his second bid. That contract provides for the restoration of the items of omission if the pending bill passes.

Under the contract with Peirce he is to receive for the restoration of item "B" of omission, \$6,368. The next lowest bidder to Peirce bid on this same work \$1,500. For item "C" of omissions Peirce receives \$39,446. The next lowest bidder bid \$17,500. For item "E" of omissions Peirce gets \$27,883. The next lowest bidder bid \$20,000. For item "H" of omissions Peirce gets \$39,865. The next lowest bidder bid \$21,500. For item "J" of omissions Peirce gets \$40,471. The next lowest bidder bid \$21,500. For item "O" of omissions Peirce gets \$39,053. The next lowest bidder bid \$20,000. For item "Q" of omissions Peirce gets \$13,530. The next lowest bidder bid \$1,500.

And this is only a beginning of the facts which I might state

to you if I had the time. Under the Peirce contract he will receive an extra sum of \$156,860 if the ornamental metal work, etc., is changed to a solid bronze instead of electroplated work. The next lowest bidder offered to make this change for an increase of only \$110,000—a gift to Mr. Peirce of \$46,860.

Under Peirce's contract he is to receive an extra sum of \$14,300 if the decorations in the wood trim be made of real wood carving instead of composition. The next bidder offered to make this change for \$4,900.

I have not the time to go much further into the matter now. On one item here there is a difference in Peirce's favor between \$50,000 and \$135,000 between his contract and the next bidder.

The contract with Mr. Peirce for the interior work is on his bid of \$997,500, but the extras provided in that contract, as stated by the special architect in his recent letter to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, amount to \$943,337.58; main contract, \$997,500; extras, \$943,337.58. The highest prices are on the extras.

Mr. Speaker, I am as anxious as anyone to have the Chicago building finished in a fitting and noble manner. I have not the slightest doubt but that it will be so done in any event. There is no danger of a poor finish in the building. A poor finish is not provided for by any of the specifications or plans, and no one has ever expected that the building would be finished in accordance with the Peirce bid of \$997,500. The building will be properly finished.

But how much prouder the people of Chicago can be if, after the building is finished, they can say "It is not only beautiful, but it was built honestly."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

[Mr. MERCER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly in reference to the item for the Chicago building, simply for the sake of correcting some misapprehension on the part of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and some misconceptions which may have been given to the House by the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

I must say at the outset that I entertain nothing but sentiments of the greatest friendship and esteem for my colleague, but I can not refrain from saying that he has given to the House in his brief remarks—and perhaps owing exclusively to the brevity of his argument—a misconception in reference to the contracts for this building. Now, the gentleman from Iowa, who spoke first in opposition to this measure, opposed the Chicago item solely, so far as I could gather it, on account of the rapid growth of the city of Chicago and the demands of the post-office building.

I sincerely trust that our city will never grow too large or our citizens feel too proud of its size and the beauty of its structures to extend always a cordial and hospitable greeting to our neighbor and friend from Iowa, and when he comes to Chicago, as all good people do, after this appropriation has been made and embodied in this building, I will undertake to show him the most beautiful and best adapted building for transacting public business in the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa said that he did not feel like spending \$790,000 on interior decorations, and something in the remarks of my colleague may also have led the members of this body to imagine that this appropriation was to be used for decorative purposes. Let me state briefly the actual facts. The contract has been let for the interior finish of the Chicago post-office building in alternatives. One of the bids was for what I shall call, for the purposes of this argument, an inferior finish. The other bid was for a superior finish, costing, in round numbers, \$800,000 more.

What is the difference between this inferior and this superior finish? As near as I can describe it to members here by reference to buildings with which they are familiar, the inferior finish is the finish that was used in public and business buildings some ten or fifteen years ago, an inferior finish similar to that of the Chicago Opera House Building in Chicago, similar to that of the Maltby Building in this city, and other buildings of that class.

The superior finish called for in the alternative bid, and requiring the small sum of \$800,000 in addition, is a finish that will make the Chicago building in its interior similar to the Pittsburg building, the Philadelphia building, the New York Life Building in the city of Chicago, the Marquette Building with which many of you are familiar, and other modern buildings of the first class, substituting a noncorroding metal such as bronze for the iron work, substituting marble in the wainscoting for cement, and substituting stones and tiles and mosaic for wood and plaster.

The imperative necessity for this superior finish is the character of the atmosphere in our city. The increasing use of bituminous coal makes it absolutely necessary that in all buildings of a per-

manent character the interior finish must be such that it can be cleansed at all times and by vigorous means. Such a finish is used in the public library building in Chicago. That is the finish used in the Marquette Building. That is the finish used in the Monadnock Building.

Now, one word in reference to this amount. The Chicago building is the largest public building in the United States, excepting the War, State, and Navy building in Washington. The post-office business of the city of Chicago is larger than that of any other city except New York. This building is not to be a temporary building, to be replaced even with the future growth of Chicago. This building has been designed for the use of the United States courts, the custom-house, the internal-revenue offices, and for the central administrative offices of the post-office for all time to come.

As the business of the city increases and as the city grows in population no new central building will be needed, but the business will be done through separate buildings in other parts of the city. And my distinguished colleague [Mr. MANN], recognizing the march of events, has already introduced a bill in this Congress providing for such a building in the city of Chicago in his district, and I hope to vote for such a bill at the next session of Congress, and for a similar building in the west town of Chicago, and for another building in my own district.

Mr. SIMS. So this one will not do. You want more!

Mr. BOUTELL. We shall want more to meet the increasing business of our city. Now, in closing, if you ask me why I introduced the bill giving Chicago a million dollars more, and why I favor this superior finish for the Chicago building, I will not attempt to answer. The building itself is an answer. Anyone of you who, passing through our city, will glance at the graceful and magnificent proportions of that structure will admit that it is entitled to the best finish which the art of the craftsman can devise.

I do not know the contractor for the building. I never saw the man, and I never heard of him except as a man of honorable character. I do not know that he has any arrangements, private and recondite, with the architect. I do, however, know the architect, and have known him for many years as a man of the highest character and integrity in my community and here. [Applause.] And I know further, Mr. Speaker, that all the contracts for these buildings are let under the supervision of the fellow-statesman of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEBURN] who has opposed this bill; and if there is collusion in this Chicago contract between the contractor and the architect that collusion must have been had with the connivance of a man who, I think, stands as high for honesty, integrity, and business judgment as any man in this Republic, Hon. Leslie M. Shaw, of Iowa, the Secretary of the Treasury. [Applause.]

And so I say again, if you ask me why we need this superior finish, look once at this structure and ask yourselves if it does not demand it. The architect was not a mere mechanic who devised and designed that structure. He was an artist. He caught for a moment the fleet angel of inspiration and received from her the conception that has given to my city and to the nation the most graceful, beautiful, and majestic public structure in the country outside of our capital city. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, under all these circumstances, considering the nature of this contract, already let in the alternative, in view of the character of the interior finish which this building demands, considering the character and the keen conscience of the Secretary of the Treasury, under whose scrutinizing eye this contract has been let and will be enforced, I submit, sir, that the comments and strictures upon the administration of his office are uncalled for and unjust, and this item, as it now stands in the bill, is an item which should receive the generous and cordial approbation and support, not only of every member of this House, but of every citizen of the United States. [Applause.]

[Mr. MERCER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. RODEY. I ask unanimous consent to amend the bill so as to give New Mexico a site for a building.

Mr. MERCER. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken on suspending the rules and passing the bill; and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I call for a division.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, without further count I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 26, answered "present" 14, not voting 107; as follows:

YEAS—204.

Acheson,	Deemer,	Kehoe,	Rixey,
Alexander,	Dick,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Roberts,
Allen, Ky.	Dinsmore,	Knapp,	Robertson, La.
Allen, Me.	Dovener,	Kyle,	Robinson, Ind.
Applin,	Draper,	Lacey,	Rucker,
Babcock,	Dwight,	Lamb,	Ryan,
Ball, Del.	Eddy,	Landis,	Scarborough,
Ball, Tex.	Emerson,	Lawrence,	Schirm,
Bankhead,	Esch,	Lesser,	Scilly,
Bartholdt,	Feely,	Lewis, Pa.	Shackelford,
Bartlett,	Finley,	Littauer,	Shallenberger,
Bates,	Flanagan,	Livingston,	Sheppard,
Billmeyer,	Flood,	Long,	Showalter,
Blackburn,	Foerderer,	Loudenslager,	Sibley,
Boutell,	Fordney,	Lovering,	Slayden,
Bowersock,	Foss,	McAndrews,	Small,
Bowie,	Foster, Vt.	McLachlan,	Smith, H. C.
Brandegee,	Fowler,	Maddox,	Smith, S. W.
Brazeeale,	Gaines, Tenn.	Mahoney,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brick,	Gaines, W. Va.	Marshall,	Smith, Iowa
Broussard,	Gardner, Mass.	Martin,	Southard,
Brown,	Gardner, Mich.	Maynard,	Southwick,
Burk, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	Mercer,	Sparkman,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gibson,	Mickey,	Sperry,
Burkett,	Gillet, N. Y.	Miers, Ind.	Stark,
Burleigh,	Gooch,	Miller,	Stevens, Minn.
Burleson,	Graff,	Minor,	Suloway,
Burton,	Greene, Mass.	Moody,	Swanson,
Butler,	Griggs,	Morgan,	Tate,
Caldwell,	Grosvenor,	Morrell,	Tawney,
Candler,	Hamilton,	Morris,	Taylor, Ohio
Capron,	Haugen,	Moss,	Taylor, Ala.
Cassel,	Hay,	Mudd,	Thomas, N. C.
Clark,	Hedge,	Mutchler,	Tirrell,
Cochran,	Hemenway,	Needham,	Tompkins, Ohio
Conner,	Henry, Conn.	Nevin,	Trimble,
Coombs,	Henry, Tex.	Newlands,	Underwood,
Cooper, Wis.	Hill,	Olmsland,	Van Voorhis,
Cowherd,	Hitt,	Osten,	Vreeland,
Cromer,	Holliday,	Overstreet,	Wachter,
Crowley,	Hopkins,	Patterson, Pa.	Wadsworth,
Crumpacker,	Howard,	Patterson, Tenn.	Wagoner,
Currier,	Howell,	Pearre,	Warner,
Cushman,	Hughes,	Perkins,	Wiley,
Dahle,	Hull,	Powers, Me.	Williams, Ill.
Dalzell,	Irwin,	Powers, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Darragh,	Jackson, Kans.	Reeves,	Woods,
Davey, La.	Jenkins,	Richardson, Ala.	Wright,
Davidson,	Jones, Wash.		Young.
Davis, Fla.	Joy,		
	Kahn,		

NAYS—26.

Boreing,	Glass,	Payne,	Snodgrass,
Cannon,	Hepburn,	Randell, Tex.	Snook,
Clayton,	Jones, Va.	Reeder,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Cooney,	Kitchin, Claude	Richardson, Tenn.	Vandiver,
Creamer,	Lloyd,	Robb,	Weeks.
De Armond,	Mann,	Russell,	
Dougherty,	Padgett,	Sims,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—14.

Adams,	Bishop,	Johnson,	Prince,
Adamson,	Consins,	Ketcham,	Sherman.
Barney,	Gillett, Mass.	McCleary,	
Benton,	Goldfogle,	Mahon,	

NOT VOTING—107.

Beidler,	Fleming,	Lester,	Shafroth,
Bell,	Fletcher,	Lewis, Ga.	Shattuc,
Bellamy,	Foster, Ill.	Lindsay,	Shelden,
Belmont,	Fox,	Littlefield,	Skiles,
Bingham,	Gilbert,	Loud,	Smith, Ill.
Blakeley,	Gill,	McCall,	Smith, Ky.
Brantley,	Glenn,	McClellan,	Spight,
Bristow,	Gordon,	McCulloch,	Stephens, Tex.
Bromwell,	Graham,	McDermott,	Stewart, N. J.
Brownlow,	Green, Pa.	McLain,	Stewart, N. Y.
Brundidge,	Griffith,	McRae,	Storm,
Bull,	Grow,	Metcalf,	Sulzer,
Burgess,	Hanbury,	Meyer, La.	Sutherland,
Burnett,	Haskins,	Mondell,	Swann,
Cassingham,	Heatwole,	Naphe,	Talbert,
Connell,	Henry, Miss.	Neville,	Thayer,
Conry,	Hildebrandt,	Norton,	Thomas, Iowa
Cooper, Tex.	Hooker,	Palmer,	Thompson,
Corliss,	Jack,	Parker,	Wanger,
Curtis,	Jackson, Md.	Pierce,	Warnock,
Dayton,	Jett,	Pou,	Watson,
Douglas,	Kern,	Pugsley,	Wheeler,
Driscoll,	Kleberg,	Randsell, La.	White,
Edwards,	Kluttz,	Reid,	Wilson,
Elliot,	Knox,	Rhea,	Wooten,
Evans,	Lassiter,	Robinson, Nebr.	Zenor.
Fitzgerald,	Latimer,	Ruppert,	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed with the amendments.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON, for the session.

Until further notice:

Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. MICKEY.

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. McRAE.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCALL with Mr. McCLELLAN.

Mr. FLETCHER with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.

For the rest of the day:

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. KLUTTZ.
Mr. PALMER with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. THOMAS of Iowa with Mr. SLAYDEN.
Mr. EVANS with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

On this vote:

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
Mr. HASKINS with Mr. ZENOR.
Mr. JACK with Mr. ELLIOTT.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

RECESS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I move to amend by striking out Sunday and inserting 11 o'clock Monday. We ought not to sit on Sunday.

Mr. PAYNE. I demand the previous question on my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks for the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would it be in order to offer an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The previous question is demanded. If the previous question is voted down, that may be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the previous question is voted down, I want to offer an amendment making it 11 o'clock Monday.

The SPEAKER. That will be in order when that comes.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are demanded by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 138, nays 79, answered "present" 10, not voting 124; as follows:

YEAS—138.

Acheson,	Dick,	Jenkins,	Powers, Mass.
Allen, Me.	Dovener,	Jones, Wash.	Reeder,
Ball, Del.	Draper,	Joy,	Reeves,
Barney,	Driscoll,	Kahn,	Roberts,
Bartholdt,	Eddy,	Knapp,	Schirm,
Bates,	Emerson,	Kyle,	Scott,
Bishop,	Esch,	Lacey,	Showalter,
Blackburn,	Evans,	Landis,	Sibley,
Boreing,	Fletcher,	Lessler,	Smith, Ill.
Boutell,	Foerderer,	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Iowa
Bowersock,	Fordney,	Littauer,	Smith, S. W.
Brandegee,	Foss,	Long,	Southard,
Brick,	Foster, Vt.	Loud,	Southwick,
Brown,	Fowler,	Loudenslager,	Sperry,
Burk, Pa.	Gaines, W. Va.	Lovering,	Steele,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner, Mass.	McLachlan,	Stevens, Minn.
Burleigh,	Gardner, Mich.	Mann,	Sulloway,
Burton,	Gardner, N. J.	Marshall,	Tawney,
Butler,	Gibson,	Martin,	Taylor, Ohio
Calderhead,	Gillet, N. Y.	Mercer,	Tirrell,
Cannon,	Gillet, Mass.	Miller,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Capron,	Graff,	Minor,	Tompkins, Ohio
Cassel,	Greene, Mass.	Moody,	Van Voorhis,
Conner,	Grosvenor,	Morgan,	Vreeland,
Coombs,	Haugen,	Morrell,	Wachter,
Cousins,	Hedge,	Moss,	Wadsworth,
Cromer,	Hemenway,	Mudd,	Wagoner,
Crumpacker,	Hepburn,	Needham,	Warner,
Currier,	Hill,	Olmsted,	Warnock,
Cushman,	Holliday,	Overstreet,	Weeks,
Dahle,	Hopkins,	Palmer,	Woods,
Dalzell,	Howell,	Parker,	Wright,
Darragh,	Hughes,	Payne,	Young.
Davidson,	Hull,	Pearre,	
Deemer,	Irwin,	Perkins,	

NAYS—79.

Ball, Tex.	Flood,	McAndrews,	Selby,
Bankhead,	Gaines, Tenn.	Maddox,	Shackleford,
Billmeyer,	Glass,	Mahoney,	Shallenberger,
Breazeale,	Goldfogle,	Maynard,	Sheppard,
Broussard,	Gooch,	Mickey,	Sims,
Burgess,	Griggs,	Miers, Ind.	Small,
Burleson,	Hay,	Moon,	Snodgrass,
Candler,	Henry, Tex.	Mutchler,	Snook,
Clark,	Howard,	Padgett,	Sparkman,
Clayton,	Jackson, Kans.	Patterson, Tenn.	Stark,
Cooney,	Johnson,	Randall, Tex.	Swanson,
Cowherd,	Jones, Va.	Richardson, Tenn.	Tate,
Crowley,	Kehoe,	Rixey,	Thomas, N. C.
Davis, Fla.	Kern,	Robb,	Trimble,
De Armond,	Kitchin, Claude	Robertson, La.	Underwood,
Dinsmore,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Robinson, Ind.	Udvardy,
Dougherty,	Lamb,	Rucker,	White,
Feely,	Lever,	Russell,	Williams, Ill.
Finley,	Little,	Ryan,	Williams, Miss.
Fitzgerald,	Lloyd,	Scarborough,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10.

Adamson,	Henry, Conn.	Metcalf,	Sutherland.
Bartlett,	McCleary,	Patterson, Pa.	
Benton,	Mahon,	Sherman,	

NOT VOTING—124.

Adams,	Dayton,	Knox,	Rhea,
Alexander,	Douglas,	Lassiter,	Richardson, Ala.
Allen, Ky.	Dwight,	Latimer,	Robinson, Nebr.
Aplin,	Edwards,	Lawrence,	Ruppert,
Babcock,	Elliott,	Lester,	Shafroth,
Beidler,	Flanagan,	Lewis, Ga.	Shattuc,
Bell,	Fleming,	Lindsay,	Shelden,
Bellamy,	Foster, Ill.	Littlefield,	Skiles,
Belmont,	Fox,	Livingston,	Slayden,
Bingham,	Gilbert,	McCall,	Smith, Ky.
Blakeney,	Gill,	McClellan,	Smith, H. C.
Bowie,	Glenn,	McCulloch,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brantley,	Gordon,	McDermott,	Spight,
Bristow,	Graham,	McLain,	Stephens, Tex.
Bromwell,	Green, Pa.	McRae,	Stewart, N. J.
Brownlow,	Griffith,	Meyer, La.	Stewart, N. Y.
Brundidge,	Grow,	Mondell,	Storm,
Bull,	Hamilton,	Morris,	Sulzer,
Burkett,	Hanbury,	Naphen,	Swann,
Burnett,	Haskins,	Neville,	Talbert,
Caldwell,	Heatwole,	Nevin,	Taylor, Ala.
Cassingham,	Henry, Miss.	Newlands,	Thayer,
Cochran,	Hildebrandt,	Norton,	Thomas, Iowa
Connell,	Hitt,	Otjen,	Thompson,
Conry,	Hooker,	Pierce,	Wanger,
Cooper, Tex.	Jack,	Pou,	Watson,
Cooper, Wis.	Jackson, Md.	Powers, Me.	Wheeler,
Corriss,	Jett,	Prince,	Wiley,
Creamer,	Ketcham,	Pugsley,	Wilson,
Curtis,	Kleberg,	Ransdell, La.	Wooten,
Davey, La.	Klutz,	Reid,	Zenor.

So the previous question was ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HANBURY with Mr. POU.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

For balance of day:

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut with Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky.

On this vote:

Mr. HASKINS with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. FLANAGAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERMAN). The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The question having been put,

The SPEAKER pro tempore said: The ayes appear to have it. Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I call for a division.

Mr. PAYNE. We may as well have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If this motion for a recess until to-morrow be adopted, will it be in order to have the Chaplain open the House with prayer?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 140, nays 64, answered "present" 11, not voting 136; as follows:

YEAS—140.

Acheson,	Davidson,	Howell,	Parker,
Allen, Me.	Deemer,	Hughes,	Payne,
Aplin,	Dick,	Irwin,	Pearre,
Ball, Del.	Dovener,	Jenkins,	Perkins,
Barney,	Draper,	Jones, Wash.	Powers, Me.
Bartholdt,	Driscoll,	Kahn,	Powers, Mass.
Bates,	Eddy,	Ketcham,	Reeder,
Bishop,	Emerson,	Knapp,	Reeves,
Blackburn,	Esch,	Kyle,	Roberts,
Boreing,	Evans,	Lacey,	Schirm,
Boutell,	Fletcher,	Landis,	Scott,
Bowersock,	Foerderer,	Lessler,	Showalter,
Brandegee,	Fordney,	Lewis, Pa.	Sibley,
Brick,	Foss,	Littauer,	Smith, Ill.
Brown,	Foster, Vt.	Long,	Smith, Iowa
Burk, Pa.	Fowler,	Loud,	Smith, H. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gaines, W. Va.	Loudenslager,	Smith, S. W.
Burkett,	Gardner, Mass.	Lovering,	Southard,
Burleigh,	Gardner, Mich.	McLachlan,	Southwick,
Butler,	Gardner, N. J.	Mann,	Sperry,
Calderhead,	Gibson,	Marshall,	Steele,
Cannon,	Gillet, N. Y.	Martin,	Stevens, Minn.
Capron,	Gillet, Mass.	Mercer,	Sulloway,
Cassel,	Graff,	Miller,	Tawney,
Conner,	Greene, Mass.	Minor,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Coombs,	Grosvenor,	Mondell,	Van Voorhis,
Cousins,	Hamilton,	Moody,	Vreeland,
Cromer,	Haskins,	Morgan,	Wachter,
Crumpacker,	Haugen,	Morrell,	Wadsworth,
Currier,	Hedge,	Morris,	Wagoner,
Cushman,	Hemenway,	Moss,	Warner,
Dahle,	Hepburn,	Mudd,	Warnock,
Dalzell,	Hill,	Needham,	Weeks,
Darragh,	Holliday,	Olmsted,	Woods,
	Hopkins,	Otjen,	Young.

NAYS—64.

Ball, Tex.	Flood.	McAndrews,	Shallenberger,
Bankhead,	Goldfogle,	Maddox,	Sheppard,
Billmeyer,	Gooch,	Mahoney,	Sims,
Breazeale,	Griggs,	Maynard,	Snodgrass,
Burgess,	Henry, Tex.	Miers, Ind.	Snook,
Burleson,	Howard,	Moon,	Sparkman,
Candler,	Jackson, Kans.	Mutchler,	Stark,
Clark,	Johnson,	Padgett,	Swanson,
Clayton,	Jones, Va.	Patterson, Tenn.	Tate,
Cowherd,	Kern,	Randell, Tex.	Thomas, N. C.
Creamer,	Kitchin, Claude	Richardson, Tenn.	Trimble,
De Armond,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rixey,	Underwood,
Dinsmore,	Lamb,	Russell,	Vandiver,
Dougherty,	Lever,	Ryan,	White,
Finley,	Little,	Selby,	Williams, Ill.
Fitzgerald,	Lloyd,	Shackleford,	Williams, Miss.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.

Adamson,	Hull,	Mahon,	Sherman,
Benton,	Joy,	Metcalf,	Taylor, Ohio.
Henry, Conn.	McCleary,	Patterson, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—136.

Adams,	Douglas,	Latimer,	Rucker,
Alexander,	Dwight,	Lawrence,	Ruppert,
Allen, Ky.	Edwards,	Lester,	Scarborough,
Babcock,	Elliott,	Lewis, Ga.	Shafroth,
Bartlett,	Feely,	Lindsay,	Shattuc,
Beidler,	Flanagan,	Littlefield,	Shelden,
Bell,	Fleming,	Livingston,	Skiles,
Bellamy,	Foster, Ill.	McCall,	Slayden,
Belmont,	Fox,	McClellan,	Small,
Bingham,	Gaines, Tenn.	McCulloch,	Smith, Ky.
Blakeney,	Gilbert,	McDermott,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Bowie,	Gill,	McLain,	Spight,
Brantley,	Glass,	McRae,	Stephens, Tex.
Bristow,	Glenn,	Meyer, La.	Stewart, N. J.
Bromwell,	Gordon,	Mickey,	Stewart, N. Y.
Broussard,	Graham,	Naphe,	Storm,
Brownlow,	Green, Pa.	Neville,	Sulzer,
Brundidge,	Griffith,	Nevin,	Sutherland,
Bull,	Grow,	Newlands,	Swann,
Burnett,	Hanbury,	Norton,	Talbert,
Burton,	Hay,	Overstreet,	Taylor, Ala.
Caldwell,	Heatwole,	Palmer,	Thayer,
Cassingham,	Henry, Miss.	Pierce,	Thomas, Iowa
Cochran,	Hildebrandt,	Pou,	Thompson,
Connell,	Hitt,	Prince,	Tirrell,
Conry,	Hooker,	Pugsley,	Tompkins, Ohio
Cooney,	Jack,	Ransdell, La.	Wanger,
Cooper, Tex.	Jackson, Md.	Rhea,	Watson,
Corliss,	Jett,	Richardson, Ala.	Wheeler,
Crowley,	Kehoe,	Robb,	Wiley,
Curtis,	Kieberg,	Robertson, La.	Wilson,
Davey, La.	Kluttz,	Robinson, Ind.	Wright,
Davis, Fla.	Knox,	Robinson, Nebr.	Zenor.
Dayton,	Lassiter,		

So the motion for a recess was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BULL with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. HASKINS with Mr. LAMB.

For this day:

Mr. HULL with Mr. HAY.

On this vote:

Mr. GROW with Mr. BARTLETT.

ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 17090. An act granting an increase of pension to James T. Price;

H. R. 16048. An act granting an increase of pension to John Graham;

H. R. 16858. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Foster;

H. R. 4740. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Wallace;

H. R. 14263. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Journal;

H. R. 8085. An act granting an increase of pension to David K. Wardwell;

H. R. 15748. An act granting an increase of pension to William Whitlock;

H. R. 15528. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Williams;

H. R. 15466. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Robson;

H. R. 15617. An act granting an increase of pension to William Keith;

H. R. 13323. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Barger;

H. R. 12322. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Wilcox.

H. R. 16756. An act granting an increase of pension to John Brown;

H. R. 16314. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard S. Howarth;

H. R. 15619. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Strong, alias William Clark;

H. R. 700. An act granting an increase of pension to Eben Slawson;

H. R. 13634. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen Oliva Leckie;

H. R. 14217. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Smith;

H. R. 13046. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Ludlum;

H. R. 15403. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton C. Norton;

H. R. 7760. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Graham;

H. R. 16374. An act granting an increase of pension to Alonzo S. Bowden;

H. R. 15618. An act granting an increase of pension to William O. Boughton;

H. R. 15431. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Simpson;

H. R. 12492. An act granting an increase of pension to Callie West;

H. R. 14027. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Winfrey;

H. R. 14235. An act granting an increase of pension to George White;

H. R. 8165. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Peck;

H. R. 6470. An act granting an increase of pension to Sheppard H. King;

H. R. 15696. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton D. Wells;

H. R. 12021. An act granting an increase of pension to Anson Lewis;

H. R. 6593. An act granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Graham;

H. R. 6617. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh Cool;

H. R. 16344. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Lawrence;

H. R. 16755. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie T. Fisher;

H. R. 17119. An act granting an increase of pension to James Flanagan;

H. R. 17179. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher G. Divers;

H. R. 17298. An act granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Smith;

H. R. 17303. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham W. Hoffman;

H. R. 1637. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Spaulding;

H. R. 17110. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Tracy;

H. R. 16929. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Trites;

H. R. 5762. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. T. Hostetler;

H. R. 16667. An act granting an increase of pension to Leroy N. Buell;

H. R. 16714. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. F. Gilmore;

H. R. 4533. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Mitchell;

H. R. 14929. An act granting an increase of pension to John Keen;

H. R. 12822. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael O. Sullivan;

H. R. 6189. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Potts;

H. R. 16353. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Ritchie;

H. R. 17120. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Shirar;

H. R. 16419. An act granting an increase of pension to James Harrison;

H. R. 16939. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander T. Sullinger, alias Alexander Patillo;

H. R. 10691. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Van Wie;

H. R. 17094. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus L. Kidder;

- H. R. 15793. An act granting an increase of pension to George Skinner;
H. R. 2813. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily Hawkins;
H. R. 15645. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilson French;
H. R. 17234. An act granting an increase of pension to David Flynn;
H. R. 17297. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Fox;
H. R. 15688. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Williams;
H. R. 15665. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Carr;
H. R. 15915. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Stafford;
H. R. 15894. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis P. Everett;
H. R. 3752. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Pickard;
H. R. 16857. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Kile;
H. R. 16361. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Chancellor;
H. R. 16445. An act granting an increase of pension to Luke Madden, alias John E. McDonald;
H. R. 16423. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza B. Abbott;
H. R. 16381. An act granting an increase of pension to Lymus Wallace;
H. R. 16368. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Hutchinson;
H. R. 16364. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Carney;
H. R. 13723. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Jackson;
H. R. 833. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Van Deusen;
H. R. 9912. An act granting an increase of pension to Matilda Smith;
H. R. 1422. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Merritt;
H. R. 1274. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fleming;
H. R. 17296. An act granting an increase of pension to Newton Thayer;
H. R. 11833. An act granting an increase of pension to Albanis L. Anderson;
H. R. 4155. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wende;
H. R. 16077. An act granting an increase of pension to Leighton M. Perveil, alias Charles H. Hunt;
H. R. 7708. An act granting an increase of pension to Bridget Fallon;
H. R. 11701. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Wright;
H. R. 6065. An act granting an increase of pension to James Garland;
H. R. 3681. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Wilson;
H. R. 16717. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Thompson;
H. R. 8187. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Moore;
H. R. 10869. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael K. Strayer;
H. R. 10922. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Feldhausen;
H. R. 11616. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Harris;
H. R. 11075. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Hart;
H. R. 11189. An act granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Gilbert;
H. R. 11428. An act granting an increase of pension to Plummer Lewis;
H. R. 11625. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander H. Taylor;
H. R. 11020. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Alsbach;
H. R. 11739. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Northway;
H. R. 11122. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Copley;
H. R. 11388. An act granting a pension to William Vogan;
H. R. 8061. An act granting a pension to Francis E. Wild;
H. R. 4734. An act granting a pension to Debora J. Fogle;
H. R. 10505. An act granting a pension to Mabel A. Woolsey;
H. R. 16752. An act granting a pension to Anton Sauthoff;
H. R. 16275. An act granting a pension to Isaac B. Price;
H. R. 15873. An act granting a pension to Minerva Murphy;
H. R. 17133. An act granting a pension to Kathinka Sichel;
H. R. 4723. An act granting a pension to George A. Liston;
H. R. 11546. An act granting a pension to Edward Bryan;
H. R. 16859. An act granting a pension to Florence M. Stout;
H. R. 16391. An act granting a pension to Ella F. Shandrew;
H. R. 17305. An act granting a pension to Philander H. Graves;
H. R. 16697. An act granting a pension to Ellen Johnson;
H. R. 2911. An act granting a pension to Charles M. Walker;
H. R. 11682. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Winterbottom;
H. R. 17233. An act granting a pension to John Haynes;
H. R. 15573. An act granting a pension to Cynthia Thomas;
H. R. 9274. An act granting a pension to Jessie B. Cluxton;
H. R. 10506. An act granting a pension to Francis E. Luse;
H. R. 17043. An act granting a pension to Martha Maddox;
H. R. 13701. An act granting a pension to Theodore Buri;
H. R. 10760. An act granting a pension to Wallace L. Scott;
H. R. 17093. An act granting a pension to Caroline Schaefer;
H. R. 15443. An act granting a pension to Eudora Wells;
H. R. 5907. An act granting a pension to David S. Taylor;
H. R. 5586. An act granting a pension to Oliver W. Newton;
H. R. 16309. An act granting a pension to Samuel H. Montanye;
H. R. 6656. An act granting a pension to Samantha Yant;
H. R. 14813. An act granting a pension to William Mennecke;
H. R. 16291. An act granting a pension to Laban McGahan;
H. R. 12090. An act granting a pension to Arvilla N. Stocker;
H. R. 8244. An act granting a pension to Bridget Logan;
H. R. 9237. An act granting a pension to John Wallace;
H. R. 1016. An act granting a pension to Charles S. F. Hilton;
H. R. 3026. An act granting a pension to Martha J. Bishop;
H. R. 4501. An act granting a pension to Sarah D. Lightfoot;
H. R. 3207. An act granting a pension to Johanna Buse;
H. R. 12238. An act granting a pension to Margaret A. Stuart;
H. R. 16567. An act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904;
H. R. 15520. An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands;
H. R. 13605. An act for the relief of George A. Detchemendy;
H. R. 4066. An act granting an increase of pension to Philip Krohn;
H. R. 5010. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Pace;
H. R. 14361. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Alexander;
H. R. 14236. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Chatfield;
H. R. 12602. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda Burke;
H. R. 1062. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias P. Stearns;
H. R. 9799. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Murphy;
H. R. 13772. An act granting an increase of pension to Marcus L. Vermillion;
H. R. 13793. An act granting an increase of pension to Solomon A. Alexander;
H. R. 13945. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Durant;
H. R. 12382. An act granting an increase of pension to William Sands;
H. R. 2264. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Higgins;
H. R. 13485. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa Josephine Stanwood;
H. R. 14938. An act granting an increase of pension Benjamin F. Wilson;
H. R. 15533. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. France;
H. R. 16000. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Amadon;
H. R. 5982. An act granting an increase of pension to Christine B. Knapp;
H. R. 1087. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew W. Lincoln;
H. R. 15558. An act granting an increase of pension to David A. Baldwin;
H. R. 15629. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Tattersall;
H. R. 12638. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Day;

H. R. 14448. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Cartmill;
 H. R. 304. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Duffy;
 H. R. 11371. An act granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Heiskell;
 H. R. 13713. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Randolph;
 H. R. 14160. An act granting an increase of pension to Ira J. S. Holmes;
 H. R. 6498. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Whitman;
 H. R. 15812. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucien B. Love;
 H. R. 15906. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grenne;
 H. R. 15843. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis W. Rowe;
 H. R. 15964. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Murphy;
 H. R. 17107. An act granting an increase of pension to Joanna Glazer;
 H. R. 16784. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Howe;
 H. R. 2787. An act granting an increase of pension to Cornelia S. Ribble;
 H. R. 6719. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Hall;
 H. R. 5281. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Mahan;
 H. R. 5960. An act granting an increase of pension to Lambert Johnston;
 H. R. 8023. An act granting an increase of pension to John Downing;
 H. R. 14439. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Peale;
 H. R. 1257. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Campbell;
 H. R. 16201. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeffrey Hufford;
 H. R. 16212. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Johnson;
 H. R. 16538. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Downs;
 H. R. 14930. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Houseal;
 H. R. 15404. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Hattery;
 H. R. 15440. An act granting an increase of pension to John Fullerton;
 H. R. 15721. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter A. Porter;
 H. R. 15730. An act granting an increase of pension to Hans A. Grove;
 H. R. 7736. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Allen;
 H. R. 7832. An act granting an increase of pension Elizabeth Lister;
 H. R. 15387. An act granting an increase of pension to Lott Van Nordstrand;
 H. R. 7308. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Morley;
 H. R. 7510. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Gammon;
 H. R. 7312. An act granting an increase of pension to James Curley;
 H. R. 5446. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Travis;
 H. R. 5876. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob E. Richards;
 H. R. 6101. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda E. McQuiddy;
 H. R. 6127. An act granting an increase of pension to Catherine P. McLorinen;
 H. R. 6442. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Gifford;
 H. R. 4632. An act granting an increase of pension to William P. Rhodes;
 H. R. 17306. An act granting a pension to Catherine McGuin;
 H. R. 13711. An act granting a pension to Simon M. Yates;
 H. R. 13881. An act granting a pension to William M. Wilson;
 H. R. 962. An act granting a pension to Rodney W. Anderson;
 H. R. 13719. An act granting a pension to Nancy McGuire;
 H. R. 942. An act granting a pension to John R. Dougherty;
 H. R. 16476. An act granting a pension to Catherine Rayel;

H. R. 13612. An act granting a pension to Margaret Bell;
 H. R. 4952. An act granting a pension to Abner D. Rutherford;
 H. R. 15842. An act granting a pension to Mary H. Talcott;
 H. R. 15636. An act granting a pension to Matilda Tunison;
 H. R. 4925. An act granting a pension to Joel Thomason;
 H. R. 6969. An act granting a pension to Biss C. Morrill;
 H. R. 7367. An act granting a pension to Ellen D. Campbell;
 H. R. 7710. An act granting a pension to Margaret Scanlon;
 H. R. 7844. An act granting a pension to Alonzo Pendland;
 H. R. 2913. An act granting a pension to Catherine A. Sawdy;
 H. R. 11958. An act granting a pension to Henry H. Winds;
 H. R. 14091. An act granting a pension to Charles A. Warrick;
 H. R. 15962. An act granting a pension to Catherine T. R. Matthews;
 H. R. 3261. An act granting a pension to George R. Grubaugh;
 H. R. 12611. An act granting a pension to Alexander J. Thomson;
 H. R. 2616. An act granting a pension to Mary J. Goodrich;
 H. R. 8005. An act granting a pension to Samantha A. Newcomb;
 H. R. 5028. An act for the relief of Francis M. Oliver;
 H. R. 2199. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jonas Albert; and
 H. R. 16352. An act to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Mary La Tourette Stotsenburg," approved June 2, 1900.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GRIGGS. I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence during the remainder of this session, on account of the illness of my wife.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

The result of the vote was then announced; and accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until to-morrow, Sunday, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation for completing the steam tender *Oleander*—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, relating to the preparation and printing of certain statements of public expenditures in Cuba and the Philippines—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a list of preliminary examinations and surveys heretofore made of all projects under construction or maintenance, and the totals of appropriations for rivers and harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a statement as to the civilian engineers employed on rivers and harbor work—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on River and Harbors, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 145) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for the removal of shoal in North River of New York Harbor," approved July 1, 1902, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3882); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17330) providing for the removal of the port of entry in the customs collection district in Alaska from Sitka, Alaska, to Juneau, Alaska, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3883); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15924) constituting Utica, N. Y., a port of delivery, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3884); which said bill and

report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 7307) to provide certain souvenir medallions for the benefit of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3885); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 7152) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1902, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3886); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6689) for the protection of wild animals, birds, and fish in the forest reserves of the United States, submitted the views of the minority thereon, to accompany report (No. 3862, part 2); which said views were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. GOLDFOGLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 908) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3887); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 17535) to appropriate the sum of \$50,000 to erect a public building at Kingfisher, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17536) to appropriate the sum of \$50,000 to erect a public building at Perry, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17537) to appropriate the sum of \$50,000 to erect a public building at Shawnee, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17538) to appropriate the sum of \$50,000 to erect a public building at El Reno, Okla.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 17539) providing for the issue and circulation of national bank notes, for the safe-keeping of public money, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEHOE: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 95) that the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to have printed 250,000 maps of the United States and possessions—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: A resolution (H. Res. 474) referring to the Court of Claims H. R. 15388, for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Kennedy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GLENN (by request): A resolution from the Idaho legislature, against the extension and enlargement of the Bitter Root Forest Reserve, in Idaho—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WEEKS: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Michigan, asking for the passage of H. J. Res. 144—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Memorial of legislature of Michigan, asking for the passage of H. J. Res. 144—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Memorial of the State senate of Missouri, in favor of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 17540) for the relief of Susan J. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 17541) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Champlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17542) granting a pension to Martin J. Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. APLIN: Petition of the Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill 14105, amendatory of section 1754, Revised Statutes, giving preference to veterans of the civil war for appointments in the Government service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of the Western Retail Implement and Vehicle Dealers' Association, of Abilene, Kans., and 25 citizens of the Tenth Congressional district of Missouri, against the enactment of the parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Liberty Lodge, No. 23, and of Missouri Lodge, No. 20, Order of Mutual Protection, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an amendment to the Post-Office appropriation bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURTON: Petition of Northern Ohio Druggists' Association, urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOMBS: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union, of Eureka, Cal., favoring House bill 16457, relating to gifts in connection with the sale of tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of J. W. Kinney and other citizens of the Sixteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, favoring a monument to the memory of Commodore Barry, the first commodore of the United States—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DWIGHT: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, urging the passage of House bill 14105, amending section 1754 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the New York Plate Printers' Union, No. 5, of New York City, urging the passage of House bill 3076, for an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petitions of W. G. Eaton Post, of Otsego; I. C. Woodman Post, No. 196, of Lawton, and S. D. Haight Post, No. 348, of Scottville, Mich., Grand Army of the Republic, and veterans of the civil war at Lawrence, Mich., in support of House bill 17103, permitting the payment of the value of public lands to persons entitled to make entry upon such lands in certain cases—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of J. B. Peatling and 13 citizens of Ganges, Mich., in support of the Hepburn bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of Buck-Reiner Company and Bloom Collier Company, of Keokuk, Iowa, and resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 181, of Fort Madison, Iowa, in favor of the passage of House bill 16457—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, sundry petitions of business men and citizens of Keokuk, Iowa, for the improvement of the Upper Mississippi River to a depth of at least 6 feet at low water between Minneapolis and St. Louis—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NORTON: Petition of Arend Brothers and 11 others, asking for the defeat of a bill requiring small vessels propelled by gas, naphtha, or electric motors to be subject to the same regulations as provided for steam vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PALMER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Newtown, Orangeville, and Warren County, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 317, of Wilkesbarre, Pa., favoring House bill 16457, relating to gifts in connection with the sale of tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of 24 citizens of Birmingham, Mich., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. S. Baldwin and 51 others, favoring the passage of the Scott service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of General R. A. Alger Camp, No. 11, National League of Veterans and Sons, for the passage of a bill to pay civil war veterans \$1.25 per acre for public lands they did not accept—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of El Paso Division, No. 69, Order of Railway Conductors, El Paso, Tex., in favor of the passage of the Foraker safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.